UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

*Official Records*

FIRST COMMITTEE
29th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 11 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 29th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ELARABY (Egypt)

later: Mr. SUH (Republic of Korea)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

- Special meeting devoted to the consideration of the report of the Secretary-General issued under agenda item 63 (f), entitled "New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold-War Era"

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61816 2707V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.29
22 December 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

SPECIAL MEETING DEVOTED TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ISSUED UNDER AGENDA ITEM 63 (f), ENTITLED "NEW DIMENSIONS OF ARMS REGULATION AND DISARMAMENT IN THE POST-COLD-WAR ERA" (A/C.1/47/7)

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the Committee's decision taken at its 26th meeting on Thursday, 5 November, this morning's meeting is devoted to the consideration of the report of the Secretary-General submitted under agenda item 63 (f), entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7).

The first speaker is the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, on whom I now call.

Mr. PETROVSKY (Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs): I am pleased to have another opportunity to address the First Committee. At this session the Committee, under your able leadership, Sir, has already achieved tangible results, and the debates, from my point of view, have been both inspiring and constructive.

At this point in the work of the Committee, I should like again to draw the attention of representatives to the report "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7), which was recently presented to the Committee by the Secretary-General. The report outlines how the world Organization can become an effective instrument for translating international consensus on disarmament issues into operating reality, thus fulfilling its objective of maintaining international peace and security, which is indeed the essence of the Charter.

(Mr. Petrovsky)

In the field of disarmament we face a twin challenge of problems and structure. The answer to the substantial part of this challenge is the triple concept in the report: integration, globalization and revitalization.

To achieve genuine disarmament, both nuclear and conventional, we need to integrate it into the broader structure of an international system of peace and security, along with economic and social concerns. The conflict resolution efforts - preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and peace-building, should go hand in hand with concrete, specific measures of arms regulation and disarmament. We need to globalize disarmament and to engage all States in the process. The draft Convention on a comprehensive prohibition of chemical weapons is one example of the globalization of the process. And, of course, we need to build upon, and revitalize, past achievements in the field of arms regulation and disarmament. The existing system of agreements and treaties form a solid basis for further achievements.

As for the challenge of structure, the Secretary-General raised in his report some important and urgent issues, which in my opinion should be addressed by the Committee. In particular, I have in mind the reassessment of the international machinery for disarmament negotiations. Reform, renewal and revitalization are part of the life of any organization. The concept of revitalization may be particularly helpful in this respect. As a practical example, I should like to refer to the work of the 1978 special session of the General Assembly ondisarmament and the papers presented there.

It was once said that the documents of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament were the "Bible" of disarmament. Indeed, if we review this material we will see that it contains a wealth of

(Mr. Petrovsky)

ideas whose time may finally have come. Not only are the documents of the session of considerable importance, but so are the annexes.

While considering the larger question of the machinery, we find it encouraging that this year the Committee has noticeably enhanced the efficiency of its work. For the first time there is a joint discussion of the disarmament and international security agenda items, which probably should be considered as practical implementation of the concept of integration. The number of draft resolutions submitted for approval has also decreased significantly. However, these are just the first, and very cautious, steps in the right direction.

I should like to tell the Committee quite frankly that we do not have any ready-made recipes for the reorganization of the multilateral machinery for disarmament. Rather, we suggest a collective search on the basis of past experience and the new vision of the world. The only strong intention that we have is to strengthen the Office for Disarmament Affairs of the Department of Political Affairs as a focal point of the Secretariat in this field. We are very thankful for the contribution to the World Disarmament Campaign, which continues to be our major activity. We believe that the Office for Disarmament Affairs, while continuing its valid experience in the field of dissemination of information and bringing disarmament know-how to different regions of the world, should become much more action oriented. In this context, the arms Register to be put into effect next spring will be of particular importance. We need the strong support of Member States in order to carry it out successfully.

(Mr. Petrovsky)

In my opinion, the focus of the Committee's efforts in the changing world should be to concentrate on the substance of disarmament and international security issues, rather than on the form; to go ahead boldly; and to demonstrate an unorthodox, innovative approach. There is an urgent problem of linking disarmament measures with the efforts to settle regional conflicts and the work of preventive diplomacy. We have just taken the first step in this direction by dealing with matters of preventive diplomacy and peacemaking in Europe and Asia.

It is also very important to look at the new problems which are beginning to appear on the disarmament agenda. As I have mentioned, an entirely new set of so-called post-disarmament issues is emerging, issues which have not yet been properly addressed by the disarmament community. The challenge is to formulate a vision of what must be done in order to come face to face with a new and varied generation of problems in the field of arms regulation and disarmament.

(Mr. Petrovsky)

All our aims and priorities as set forth in the report of the Secretary-General are practical and achievable. It can be said that as long as history has been recorded human beings have fought each other. Let philosophers argue whether aggressiveness is inherent to human nature. However, with the advances in the development of weapons, societies can no longer afford to solve their problems by means of the threat of mutual annihilation. We must find new and improved ways of directing conflicts into non-violent channels, and in international politics one of the most important means of reducing violence in inter-State relations is arms regulation and disarmament - one of the major aims of the United Nations.

I strongly hope that the representatives in the First Committee, who are actually the best of the disarmament experts in our world today, will be able to find the solutions to the urgent issues we are facing today in this changing world.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that the Committee will reflect upon the Under-Secretary-General's statement, and will fully share the views he has expressed.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom): The European Community and its member States would like to thank the Secretary-General for his report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", which he introduced in his statement on the occasion of the celebration by the First Committee of Disarmament Week.

We would also wish to join you, Mr. Chairman, in welcoming Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky to this important meeting, and to thank him for his statement, which will be studied with great interest.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

As we made clear in our contribution to the general debate on 12 October, we share the Secretary-General's view of the dramatic changes that have occurred in the world and the significant progress that has been achieved in a number of important areas of disarmament. It is also true that, while the world has become safer - particularly thanks to the ending of the cold war - new uncertainties and challenges have appeared in the armed conflicts raging in a depressing number of parts of the globe. This underscores the Secretary-General's contention that disarmament remains centrally relevant to the international agenda.

The Secretary-General offered a pertinent perspective with his three key words - integration, globalization and revitalization. We should like to reflect briefly on these.

First, integration. It is very true that many problems of the world are interrelated. Security is indivisible and has many components. Disarmament matters affect, and are affected by, political and economic factors. Disarmament cannot and never could be isolated from the various aspects of the security of States. Furthermore, in the light of the changes which have taken place recently, we agree with the Secretary-General that there is greater scope for integrating disarmament and arms regulation isssues into the broader structure of the international peace and security agenda.

Thus, in addition to existing efforts to achieve increased security at the lowest possible level of armaments, we need to give renewed emphasis to: the peaceful settlement of conflicts, in particular at the regional level; the need to curb the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which is a threat to international peace and security, as stressed by the Security Council on 31 January this year; and the growing importance of

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

confidence-building measures and transparency with regard to armaments as well as transfers of high technology.

These interrelated aspects call for complementary approaches by the international community through the relevant multilateral frameworks, maintaining and utilizing the appropriate expertise. This leads us to the concept of globalization: we completely share the Secretary-General's view that all States should be genuinely engaged in the process of disaramament. As he pointed out:

> "The argument advanced by some States that the major military Powers should disarm first is too often used to avoid practical disarmament measures and is no longer valid." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 15)

and:

> "The goal is to extend disarmament efforts to include not only bilateral agreements but also multilateral arrangements in a world-wide process involving all States". (A/C.1/47/7, para. 15)

In sum, our view is that globalization implies giving appropriate weight to unilateral actions, to bilaceral agreements and to multilateral arrangements at both regional and global levels.

The conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention is the most recent evidence of successful action at the global level. In the nuclear field, beyond the decisions of the two major nuclear-weapon States drastically to reduce their arsenals, other nuclear-weapon States have made reductions in some of their nuclear weapons programmes, limitations on testing have been introduced by several nuclear-weapon States and the international community has an important role to play to further the process of nuclear disarmament. The 154 States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

Weapons are preparing for the 1995 Conference, which should lead, as the Secretary-General stressed, to the indefinite extension of that vital Treaty.

The United Nations has established the Register of Conventional Arms and is committed to considering modalities for its early expansion. We look forward to full participation in the Register by Member States.

The Conference on Disarmament has begun to address the means of increasing transparency in armaments and transfers of high technology with military applications. We should build on this firm foundation. It is for each and every one of us to play his full part.

Revitalization: recent breakthroughs in all aspects of arms control and disarmament - bilateral, global and regional - have created a real determination to continue the process effectively. We must now ensure that we have the tools to build on that success. In this regard, major developments are occurring in the United Nations system.

With its historic Summit Meeting of 31 January 1992, the Security Council has enhanced its role as the supreme organ of the international community for the maintenance and restoration of peace and security, for the management of crises and the enforcement of international norms relating to the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The General Assembly and its subsidiary organs are working in a new spirit. The Disarmament Commission, as the United Nations deliberative organ on disarmament, has streamlined its work, and we support its efforts to focus on more concrete subjects. The First Committee is experiencing a growing sense of consensus on forward-looking and practical endeavours, which enables member States to take a global view of disarmament and security.

The Secretariat is engaged in a process of restructuring, which we welcome. We expect that this will allow it to continue to perform effectively the tasks assigned to it by Member States.

The central role of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating body of the international community has once again been demonstrated. With the conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention, the first world-wide treaty to eliminate in a verifiable way a whole class of weapons of mass destruction, the Conference on Disarmament has demonstrated its capacity to perform effectively challenging and complex tasks. As the Secretary-General notes, the Conference on Disarmament has also decided to embark upon a process of review of its agenda, membership and methods of work with a view to fulfilling its role, taking into account the necessary interrelationship of the various aspects of international security. In order to enable it fully to assume its responsibilities, we support an early enlargement of the membership, which would more adequately reflect the level of interest in its work on the part of the international community as a whole. We trust that the Conference will report to the General Assembly in the near future on the results of its consideration of these issues.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

As the Secretary-General's report makes clear, much hard work lies ahead. All of us should do our utmost to ensure that the goals of the international community highlighted by the Secretary-General are indeed achieved. For their part, the European Community and its member States will spare no effort in that direction.

Ms. MASON (Canada): The Canadian Government considers that the Secretary-General's report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7) is a welcome complement to "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277). It offers the prospect of real solutions to the problems which face the United Nations in the field of peace and security as it moves away from the cold-war rhetoric that so typified past debate and begins to define a course of action to enable the international community to respond more effectively to the new post-cold-war challenge of promoting a system of global cooperative security.

In the field of non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament, the Canadian Government strongly supports the central thesis of the report, that three key themes - integration, globalization and revitalization - are the foundation-stones of an intensified international effort to enhance the effectiveness of arms control and disarmament. In particular, we echo the assertion - as the representative of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the Twelve, has just done - that the process of arms limitation and disarmament is the business of every State. Likewise, we echo the agreement of the Twelve with the Secretary-General's assertion that disarmament continues to be centrally relevant to international peace and security.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

We agree in principle with the concept that disarmament and inspection procedures play an important part in the field of peace enforcement. We would add that verification of arms-limitation and disarmament agreements can also facilitate United Nations activities with respect to preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict peace-building.

Canada is also encouraged to see a growing interest among nations in developing regional approaches to arms control and disarmament. Canada's view is that regional approaches to disarmament can make valuable contributions to the collective pursuit of the broader objectives of disarmament and international security.

Canada notes the important role of the Office for Disarmament Affairs in supporting regional approaches to disarmament and in putting into operation the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. As I stated in my statement in the general debate on 15 October, Canada believes that the United Nations has an important role to play in promoting informal mechanisms for dialogue, particularly in regions or subregions where institutional frameworks for such discussions are not yet fully developed. Canada commends these ongoing activities of the Office for Disarmament Affairs.

Clearly, many other Member States feel the same way, as is evidenced by the support given to the three United Nations regional centres, and to other related activities of the Office for Disarmament Affairs, at the Tenth United Nations Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign. Participating Member States will recall that this year a trend of the past few years towards less and less pledges, was dramatically reversed, with an increase of over 50 per cent from the previous year's total.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

We wholeheartedly agree with the Secretary-General's observation that transparency in armaments and other confidence-building measures are an important trend to encourage and that the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is an important practical step. We particularly welcome the Secretary-General's assurance that the United Nations will do all it can to make the Register a success including, we assume, ensuring that sufficient resources are devoted to it. For our part, Canada has consistently and actively supported the concept of transparency in armaments. We intend to work actively to ensure that as many States as possible comply fully with the arms Register, providing both data and information by the due-date of April 1993.

Despite positive developments in recent years, we recognize that the proliferation of technology and equipment capable of making weapons of mass destruction continues to be a source of instability and, in the words of the historic Security Council summit statement of 31 January 1992, a threat to international peace and security. The multilateral system must respond quickly and continue to focus on two key approaches. The first is to confirm and strengthen existing global instruments - the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons, to name two - including also such tasks as signing and ratifying the chemical weapons Convention, concluding a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, and developing further and, where possible, harmonizing export controls on sensitive technologies. The second approach is to develop and apply regional arms control regimes linking global and specific regional measures as required.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

We encourage all countries to become original signatories of the chemical weapons Convention and to sign the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty. In the words of the Secretary-General, the NPT must be extended indefinitely and unconditionally.

The proposal to examine the role of private international arms dealers and their connection to the burgeoning problem of international arms transfers is noted with interest. It is disturbing to observe that such transfers are being made at the cost of human, social and economic development. The proposal for the establishment of a task force to provide Member States with advice on military conversion programmes is also, in our view, to be commended.

The global security environment has been changing rapidly since the end of the cold war. Opportunities and challenges abound as the international order is restructured. As the Special Commission established by the Security Council has demonstrated, there are opportunities for the Council to become involved in peace-keeping, peace-building and peacemaking, particularly in the field of verification methods. In this regard, Canada would be most interested in receiving further details concerning the role the Secretary-General envisages for the Security Council in disarmament matters, and in particular in the enforcement of non-proliferation.

We strongly support the Secretary-General's proposal to undertake a reassessment of the United Nations disarmament machinery in order to ensure that it is able to meet the new realities and priorities of our time. A useful starting-point, in our view, would be to recall the main functions of each of the three multilateral arms control and disarmament bodies: the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

In Canada's view, the role of the First Committee, a global deliberative body, is to identify priorities on the multilateral arms control and disarmament agenda, to spotlight issues and to build support and momentum, that is, to expand the common ground as an essential first step in the broader process of international norm-building as it relates to arms control and disarmament. This process not only contributes to the identification and promotion of broad principles, but increasingly, as the arms Register so graphically demonstrates, focuses on concrete steps which the international community can take towards the achievement of the broader goals or norms.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

I turn to the United Nations Disarmament Commission, the second global deliberative body. In our view, its prime role is to allow focused discussion of a limited agenda without the pressure of voting on resolutions. Its role encompasses conceptual discussion and consensus-building with respect to arms control and related international security issues - for example, transfer of technology - as well as the identification of global and regional measures for negotiation elsewhere.

The role of the Conference on Disarmament, of course, is to negotiate global arms control and disarmament instruments.

Thus the three multilateral arms control and disarmament bodies have distinct yet complementary and interrelated functions. The central issue in the reform process then is how best to rationalize the work of these three bodies to ensure that each singly - and the three in combination - contributes as effectively as possible to the promotion of global cooperative security.

In Canada's view, as I stated on 15 October, the starting point should be the role of the Office for Disarmament Affairs as the focal point of a revitalized United Nations role in multilateral arms control and disarmament. Therefore, Canada particularly welcomes the commitment given by you, Mr. Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky, in his statement here today, to the strengthening of the Office for Disarmament Affairs so that it can indeed serve as such a focal point.

With regard specifically to the First Committee, we clearly need to accelerate the task of rationalization, of setting concrete and practical priorities and of continuing to ensure fewer resolutions and more genuine dialogue.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

The Friends-of-the-Chair process under the auspices of the Chairman of the First Committee is an important mechanism, in our view, and we therefore need to consider how we can pursue this work between sessions in an effective manner.

It is with regard to the United Nations Disarmament Commission that the reform process is most advanced. We have moved beyond conceptual discussions and are in the midst of tackling very concrete problems with respect to the management of the new agenda in order to ensure predictability, while allowing us to incorporate contemporary issues in a timely way.

Beyond this, however, in our view the Disarmament Commission is at a stage where it has too much time to engage in general debate, but - without more advance preparation by delegations - too little time for in-depth dialogue on complex issues in respect of which there still exist some fundamental differences of view. In order for the Disarmament Commission to live up to its full potential, every effort must be made to circulate focused working papers - preferably reflecting the joint efforts of a number of countries spanning differences of view - in advance of the session so that delegations come prepared for in-depth dialogue.

Canada strongly supports the Secretary-General's call for the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its efforts to rationalize its agenda and membership in order to reflect changed geopolitical circumstances. However, Canada has reservations about the notion of having the Conference on Disarmament take on the role of a permanent review and supervisory body for some existing multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements. In our

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

view, the focus of the Conference on Disarmament should not be diverted away from being the sole body in the United Nations family with the authority to negotiate global arms control agreements.

I noted earlier the interrelationship of the three multilateral arms control and disarmament bodies, and this is one issue that has been singled out in the Friends-of-the-Chair process to which I referred earlier. In Canada's view our reform process - including any inter-session mechanism which might be developed - must take account of this interrelationship and of the fact that no one of the three bodies is competent on its own to take full charge of this issue.

The report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", like "An Agenda for Peace", is a thought-provoking document. We agree with the assertion that there is a parallel between conflict resolution and disarmament; the process of conflict resolution must be supported by concrete arms control and disarmament measures. The Secretary-General's personal commitment to these issues is most welcome.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): A proposal by the non-aligned countries made this meeting possible. We appreciate this opportunity for a dialogue with Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky on questions of interest to all the members of the First Committee. We share his opinion that with this meeting the General Assembly is embarking on a collective quest in the field of disarmament following decades of bipolar confrontation. In that quest we should identify the problems and the multilateral structure to try to resolve them. We must also endeavour to make our interventions brief and our discussion concrete on these subjects, both today and in the future.

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

Since its establishment the United Nations has worked to achieve disarmament, starting with nuclear disarmament. In the 1950s the two main goals of United Nations action in this field were defined as the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and general and complete disarmament under effective international control. With the passage of time we succeeded in strengthening the United Nations Secretariat in the field of disarmament and the General Assembly at its special session in 1978 reached unanimous agreement on the content of a document covering the whole spectrum of disarmament-related issues, including the so-called disarmament machinery: the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee of the General Assembly. A few years ago the Disarmament Commission began a process of reform, and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva is now examining its role as the single multilateral negotiating forum, in the light of the conclusion of the Convention on the elimination of chemical weapons.

Moreover, with the end of the cold war and the change of Secretary-General, the United Nations is trying to adapt to the new international reality. The Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January last and the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) are clear signs of that process of adaptation, as is the report of the Secretary-General entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7), which should be carefully considered, since it points in new directions, directions that perhaps we have not yet all understood. We are concerned, for example, that the report contains no mention of the 1978 Final Document.

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

Of course, in any process of change Member States should be in a position to participate actively in defining the changes. The last time that was done was at the special session of the General Assembly in 1978, and it may be appropriate to convene another special session. That will take time, and time is precisely what is lacking now. That is why we have started to talk of the possibility of holding a brief resumed session of the First Committee in February or March. "Brief" should be understood to mean about five days. The purpose of the session would be to examine the functions and interrelationship of the various disarmament forums as well as proposals to change the structure of the Secretariat in this area. There should be an open and detailed exchange of opinions in order to achieve agreement on what we expect of the various forums and of the Secretariat in the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

For this, it will be necessary to know in detail the opinions and intentions of countries and of the Secretariat itself.

In conclusion, my delegation considers that the many achievements in the Secretariat and as regards organs, forums and machinery - what the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Petrovsky, termed "the structure" - should not be set aside for the benefit of a supposedly pragmatic approach to the present situation. Of course, no one can defend all the bureaucratic preserves and structures, but no one can deny that the United Nations Secretariat has done good work in this field, and to reduce it just for the sake of reducing it would not make much sense. It is true that East-West confrontation has disappeared, but the weapons are still there. They are still being produced, and they are still being sold. Our approach - our starting point - may have changed since the cold war, but the goals remain the same: to achieve a more secure and therefore less armed world.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): The delegation of Finland is grateful for this opportunity to address the Secretary-General's recent report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7). The report and the Secretary-General's remarks at the meeting of the First Committee on 27 October (A/C.1/47/PV.18) constitute a timely call for a new look at the United Nations role in arms control and disarmament. They have now been followed up by an important statement by Mr. Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, for which we thank him. We fully agree with the Secretary-General that the end of bipolarity has not diminished the need for disarmament; if anything, it has increased it.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

At the same time, it is important to note that with the end of bipolarity, the traditional United Nations disarmament agenda dominated by that same bipolarity is increasingly out of focus. In our view, the need for increased United Nations involvement in arms control and disarmament does not lie in the zealous pursuit of the old agenda. It lies in getting to grips with the new dimensions of the problem of overarmament. It lies in addressing new kinds of threats and new kinds of opportunities. The break-up of the rigid divisions between East, West and the non-aligned has created an unparalleled opportunity for cooperation along new, issue-oriented lines.

As the Secretary-General observes, disarmament is an inherent part of preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict peace-building. All of those tasks can be supported by various concrete measures from demobilization to de-mining, and it is important that they be so supported. Conceptually, however, there is very little new about this type of United Nations activity in comparison to the cold war era, except its scale and geographical dispersion.

What really is new in the post-cold-war era is the integration of disarmament with United Nations peace enforcement. Disarmament and inspection procedures play a direct role in the implementation of Security Council resolution 687 (1991) concerning Iraq. Despite difficulties, the job is getting done successfully. In our view, the activities of the United Nations Special Commission could provide useful experience and guidance for further innovation in the event that similar operations are required by the international community in the future.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

It is vital for the security of all Member States that the United Nations is ready to act in accordance with its Charter if faced again with grave violations of multilateral disarmament agreements or with other threats to the peace.

In our view, the United Nations could also play a useful role in assisting conversion of military assets into more productive uses. This is particularly important with respect to the nuclear weapons industry within the former Soviet Union. The Secretary-General's report contains valuable thoughts on this complex issue.

In broader terms, there is a need to integrate discussion of the new dimensions of disarmament with other major preoccupations of the international community, such as development, the environment and respect for humanitarian law.

Discussion of the relationship between disarmament and development, for example, is more and more influenced by the levels of military versus social spending in recipient countries. Military technology can also be used to support protection of the environment; also, existing treaties such as the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techiques can be employed to deal with novel environmental threats.

The tragic situation in the former Yugoslavia points up the need to relate disarmament efforts to the rigorous implementation of international humanitarian law.

The globalization of the bipolar confrontation stymied much of the multilateral and regional efforts towards disarmament. Linkages abounded.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

The end of bipolarity offers a unique chance for a true globalization of disarmament efforts, particularly in terms of the regional approach. No longer will what could be called the "after-you" approach to disarmament do. As the Secretary-General aptly notes, the argument advanced by some States that the major military Powers should disarm first is too often used to avoid practical disarmament measures.

The relentless accumulation of conventional weapons, whether through transfers or local production, in regions of tension requires much more attention than heretofore. In the case of the Middle East as well as that of the former Yugoslavia, we note with hope that the respective peace processes pay attention to the need for confidence-building. The wider European experience in the context of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) process provides useful pointers in this regard.

There is another aspect of globalization I would like to touch upon, namely that of institutions. We fully agree with the Secretary-General when he says that the machinery should be reassessed in order to meet the new realities and priorities of our time. There is a particular need to take a new look at the Conference on Disarmament, the body that is there to negotiate for all of us, even if all of us are not members. It is well known that Finland wishes to become a member. In our view, membership should be open to all those who apply for it and demonstrate a willingness to make a contribution. We thus noted with particular appreciation that the Secretary-General stated in his remarks that membership of the Conference on Disarmament must be open to a larger number of States.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

We hope that the Conference on Disarmament concludes its ongoing consultations rapidly. The time has come to proceed to practical action on expanding membership. The new, open Conference on Disarmament can then tackle the new priorities in terms of its working agenda with renewed vigour. With a new, open Conference on Disarmament in operation, the role of, and indeed the need for, the United Nations Disarmament Commission should be reviewed. There might not be a need for a separate deliberative organ once the open Conference on Disarmament is in play.

In any event, it would seem to us that the review of the United Nations disarmament machinery should be accomplished in a coordinated and comprehensive manner. A special session of the General Assembly, the first post-cold-war special session on disarmament, at the appropriate time might be an option.

Building on past achievements is not only sensible, it is vital. That is nowhere more so than in the case of non-proliferation. Non-proliferation was not an East-West issue. It is not, and should not come to be viewed as, a North-South issue. The Secretary-General reminds us that all States should adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and that it should be extended indefinitely and unconditionally in 1995. We wholeheartedly agree. We also consider that all States should sign, ratify and implement the Convention on chemical weapons. Prompt adherence is particularly important in those regions where chemical weapons constitute a clear threat to regional stability, even peace.

Multilateral export control regimes will be a necessary complement to non-proliferation efforts for quite some time ahead. Finland fully subscribes

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

to a number of them. This does not, in our view, exclude a wider multilateral dialogue on universally acceptable international norms or guidelines concerning international transfers of high technology with military applications.

The United Nations can facilitate non-proliferation and arms regulation efforts. A start has been made. The United Nations already plays an operational role in confidence-building in the biological weapons area. It will be the custodian of the Register of Conventional Arms. With these growing tasks, it is important to assure adequate funding and staff for the Office of Disarmament Affairs over the long term.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

We welcome Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky's statement just a moment ago that it is the intention of the Secretariat to strengthen the Office of Disarmament Affairs as a focal point in disarmament.

The United Nations Special Commission has gained unique experience in verification. It is important that, in view of these and other experiences, the United Nations role in verification is looked at as a whole, and that future needs are anticipated. The Canadian proposal to that effect has our full support.

The Secretary-General's present report provides an important complement to his earlier report, "An Agenda for Peace"

Disarmament is one of the first means of making peace. It would be paradoxical indeed if now that disarmament is no longer a distant vision but an everyday reality, the United Nations were to abandon its role in advancing disarmament. The Secretary-General's report leads us to expect that this will not be the case.

Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I wish at the outset of my statement to pay tribute to the Secretary-General for his valuable report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era". I also wish to thank Mr. Petrovsky, the Under-Secretary-General, for his important opening statement.

I also wish to convey the profound appreciation of Egypt's delegation for the unstinting efforts of the Secretariat and the Office of Disarmament Affairs in particular in this respect.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

The link between disarmament and international peace and security, and the importance of the pursuit of the globalization of commitment to disarmament, as well as the necessity of reinforcing the existing machinery, are matters that are worthy of consideration. As the Secretary-General states in his reports, we must exchange views on how to move forward to a more profound examination of such issues.

The report puts forth a number of constructive proposals that command consideration, of which I wish to cite the following as examples: reinforcing the role of the Security Council in implementing disarmament and arms regulation measures; follow-up and monitoring of arms control and peace-keeping by observer and peacekeeping forces; expansion of the role of the United Nations in the area of peace enforcement; a larger role for regional organizations in the field of disarmament in order to facilitate the task of the United Nations at the world level in this respect, in addition to the importance of transparency and arms transfer control.

All the above proposals are worthy of profound consideration in order to determine the means by which the desired goal may be achieved. However, we must stress, in this respect, that the key to success in achieving such a goal resides, first and foremost, in close consultation with the parties directly concerned, in taking into account the objective characteristics and circumstances of the regions in question, in addition to complete objectivity in implementation, and eschewing selectivity as well as preferential or discriminatory treatment.

(Mr. Khalil, Egypt)

This applies to the countries and the regions in question, as much as it does to disarmament issues. It is difficult, for example, to accept that a certain type of weaponry should be focused upon because it is much more amenable to measures of arms control while other more lethal weapons are pushed aside until circumstances allow us to tackle their problems.

Sense of trust that may impel countries to commit themselves to arms limitation is indivisible. Security is indivisible as well. This calls for the integration and focusing of efforts on all the conventional and non-conventional areas of armaments alike with regard to arms limitation, transparency and arms trade controls.

In conclusion, the report refers to an important variety of issues, namely those of the post-disarmament era. Transforming military-oriented industries into enterprises serving peaceful production together with the safe destruction of the arms stockpiles represent indeed the major challenge that faces the international community and the developing countries in particular. While we welcome the role of the United Nations in providing technical expertise in this respect, we have to try and define that role so that its real objective may be achieved, and thereby help the international community in general and the developing countries in particular, to face up to the challenges of the coming phase in which development will be recognized as a main component of national security.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to express to you my delegation's appreciation for holding this special meeting of the First Committee, and I should also like to thank the delegation of Indonesia for having proposed it. I note with great pleassure the presence of Mr. Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General, and I thank him for his interesting statement. I especially welcome what he said about the intention to strengthen the Office of Disarmament Affairs.

It is a very timely meeting indeed, and it provides an opportunity to discuss the implications of the new international situation for arms limitation and disarmament in general and for the role of the United Nations in this field in particular.

My delegation listened with keen interest to the Secretary-General's statement on 27 October on the occasion of Disarmament Week. We have also studied his report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era". It contains a number of interesting observations which, I am sure, will stimulate the debate in the area of arms limitation and disarmament. My delegation noted with particular interest and satisfaction that the Secretary-General emphasized the importance of enhancing the multilateral approach, his strong support for a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing and the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, his statement that all States should adhere to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and his positive appraisal of the recently concluded Convention on chemical weapons.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

The new international situation provides a number of new possibilities, not least in the field of disarmament. It is of the utmost importance, however, not to overlook the new dimensions in terms of an increased number of actors on the international scene and the disintegration of earlier structures in the domain of security policy. It is therefore more important than ever to apply an approach to these issues that takes into account the need to reach multilateral and global agreements on many of the most pressing issues on the international agenda. I am thinking in particular of the questions of non-proliferation and international arms transfers.

The problem of non-proliferation concerns all States. It was referred to by virtually all delegations in their statements in the general debate of the First Committee. It is high time the United Nations took a comprehensive approach to this matter. A natural starting point would be to make use of the deliberating body of the United Nations - namely, its Disarmament Commission - to discuss these matters and to prepare some general guidelines for non-proliferation with special emphasis on weapons of mass destruction.

The issue of international arms transfers also is already, to a considerable extent, being dealt with by the United Nations and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. Nevertheless, there is also a need to look into the problem of illicit arms transfers, and I note with interest that the Secretary-General in his report recommends that States "take a closer look at international private 'arms dealers'". He also states that

> "it is both possible and necessary to impose stricter regulations on such activities." (A/C.1/47/78, para. 31)

Against this background, it is particularly timely to take up these items - the issues of non-proliferation and illicit arms transfers - on the agenda of the Disarmament Commission, as has been proposed by Sweden and Colombia. I

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

mention this in this context not only because these proposals are made by those two countries and will affect one of the draft resolutions before the First Committee: I mention them because they also illustrate the usefulness of the Disarmament Commission as a forum for deliberations on issues that concern the entire international community but are not yet ripe for negotiations.

My delegation noted with great interest the section entitled "New machinery" in the report of the Secretary-General. In our view, the present machinery serves its purposes rather well. The difficulties in making progress on disarmament issues have little to do with the present machinery, established by the Member States through the General Assembly. They have their background in the international political situation, as we all know. This does not mean, however, that we should not actively consider what could be done to improve the machinery.

I have already referred to the Disarmament Commission. Its working methods and agenda have recently been reformed with success, and there is no reason to doubt that it will have an important function in the future too. I have also given examples of two topical issues which should, in our view, be included in its agenda in the next two years.

The Conference on Disarmament, through its President, is actively involved in consultations regarding its agenda and membership and has for several years continuously been reviewing its effective and improved functioning. Furthermore, the recent conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention was a great achievement of the Conference. The First Committee is also involved in a process of considering its working methods under the leadership of its Chairman.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

Several efforts are thus already being made to adopt the machinery to changing circumstances. The division of labour between the various parts of the disarmament machinery has been carefully crafted. However, we should, in this new international situation, give further thought to the established structure and to the role of the United Nations in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. Any possible changes must be carefully studied and considered before any decisions are taken. This is an important process which should engage all Member States. My country looks forward to participating in such a process.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): First of all, I should like to express my appreciation to Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky for his presence and valuable statement today. This is a very important meeting since it provides what might be the only opportunity for all members of the First Committee to discuss the Secretary-General's report. Therefore, I am very pleased to see Mr. Petrovsky here and hope that he will apprise the Secretary-General of the results of our discussion. The report, entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", is an important document, and I believe it is appropriate that its author has a clear understanding of how disarmament specialists think about it. After all, dialogue is always more fruitful than monologue.

The report is the first comprehensive document in which the Secretary-General has presented his views on how arms-control and disarmament efforts should proceed. It complements another important report which he prepared on security issues: "An Agenda for Peace". I sincerely appreciate this report and I am pleased to say that I support most of the elements contained in it. However, I do have some remarks to make, and if the

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

opportunity arises I would be pleased to present more detailed comments at a later time. Today, however, I shall limit myself to some preliminary remarks.

I heartily support the three main themes advocated in the report, namely, integration, globalization and revitalization. I agree with paragraph 8, concerning integration. The connections between disarmament progress and the creation of a new system of international security are indeed crucial. I believe they must complement each other. As for globalization, I agree in particular with the contents of paragraphs 15, 16 and 17. With the end of the cold war, disarmament is no longer chiefly the responsibility of two super-Powers, but the responsibility of all States: the five nuclear-weapon States and all non-nuclear-weapon States. And our experiences in the Gulf War have taught us that we must not limit our efforts to weapons of mass destruction, but should also work to reduce conventional arms. It is gratifying to know that the Secretary-General shares this view.

With regard to revitalization, I am obliged to comment on section D of chapter III, especially paragraph 36, because Japan has a strong interest in the question of transparency in armaments and the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. Paragraph 36 states that:

> "For your part, it is vitally important that sufficient resources be made available for this task." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 36)

I wish to state once again that Japan has declared its intention to make a substantial financial contribution for the establishment of a data-base system in the Office for Disarmament Affairs. My understanding is that, with this contribution, the data-base system could be established and made available for the Register too.

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

At the initial stage, the Register can be operated and maintained within the existing resources of the United Nations Secretariat if only the Secretary-General recognizes it as an important task of the Organization and gives it sufficient priority. I therefore wholeheartedly welcome the Secretary-General's assurance that the

"Organization will do all that it can to make the Register an efficient and successful service for Member States." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 36)

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

Japan fully supports the Secretary-General in his efforts to restructure the Organization and to make it more efficient. Within the context of these efforts and within existing levels of the Organization's overall resources, we trust that the reorganized Office for Disarmament Affairs will be adequately staffed to permit it not only to develop and operate the Register and the disarmament database but also to carry out efficiently its other priority tasks in the field of disarmament. In this connection, I wholeheartedly welcome Mr. Petrovsky's statement today on his firm intention to strengthen the Office.

Turning now to the concluding parts of the report, especially the section entitled "New Machinery" (part IV B), I have no objection to the Military Staff Committee providing assistance to the Security Council, as called for in the United Nations Charter. I wish to point out, however, that the delegations to the Conference on Disarmament include many competent military staff members whose advice has always been useful. My feeling is that the Security Council could in turn benefit from the advice of the Conference, in whose work the expertise of these military advisers is duly reflected. The negotiations on the Convention banning chemical weapons, for example, were greatly enhanced by the input of these military staff members.

Lastly, I would like to note that the Conference on Disarmament is now studying the ways and means of improving its effectiveness under the able chairmanship of Mr. Kamal of Pakistan. At the same time the President of the Conference, Mr. Servais of Belgium, together with Mr. Nunes Amorim of Brazil, incoming President, has taken up the question of how the Conference might adapt itself to the needs of the post-cold-war era and has started work.

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

I take note of and appreciate the views expressed in paragraph 45 of the report, but sincerely hope that the Secretary-General will formulate his views on the Conference on Disarmament on the basis of the work to be done by the Conference itself in the coming months. One point I wish to stress in this regard is that we must not lose sight of the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament.

The Conference successfully concluded its negotiations on the Convention banning chemical weapons. Its usefulness has been clearly demonstrated. Please be assured that I will not support any effort or proposal that might undermine such an important character of the Conference on Disarmament.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Russian Federation would like to join in the high praise given to the Secretary-General's report, "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold war era" (A/C.1/47/7), and to express our satisfaction that ir will be given due attention. In this respect, we welcome the opportunity provided by the holding of a special meeting here within the framework of the First Committee. I should also like to say how happy we are to see Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky among us. We consider the statement he made today a very important contribution to our discussion.

The Secretary-General's report is particularly important in that it is in a sense a conceptual sequel to his report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) and a significant and timely contribution to the discussion under way in the international community about further ways and means to develop multilateral disarmament in the post-confrontational period. Mr. Boutros-Ghali's report contains a well-thought-out analysis of the state of affairs in the disarmament process, with many innovative approaches and initiatives that cast

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

new light on the United Nations role and responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security. To repeat what some speakers have said before me, we must fully support the threefold concept of integration, globalization and revitalization of efforts to control armaments and achieve disarmament. Finally, the Secretary-General's report leads to the conclusion that it is necessary to set up new coordinated disarmament machinery that would enable the international community to respond actively and with more flexibility to the new challenges and priorities of the day.

We must answer the question of whether the existing machinery can be improved. Of course it is working now; it does yield fruit. In my opinion, the question as to whether we could improve it has many important and related aspects. There is a strategic triad, so to speak: the First Committee of the General Assembly; the Disarmament Commission, the deliberative body; and the Conference on Disarmament, the negotiating body. Further, we have a whole system of conferences to consider the operation of various multilateral agreements. International organizations that are now playing, or will in future play, an important role in carrying out multilateral disarmament agreements include the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna and, soon, the organization to be set up to deal with the ban on chemical weapons.

We cannot forget the new role already being played and to be played in future by the Security Council, including the Military Staff Committee, since the dissemination of various types of weapons could threaten international peace and security. As to the relationship between this and other links of the machinery, I would like to take note of the idea just expressed by Mr. Tanaka about possible interrelationships between the military staff

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

the Conference on Disarmament and the Security Council. It is very important that the machinery be based on the concepts of integration and revitalization, which would apply not only in the political field but also in a purely practical sense, especially in promoting an optimum relationship between cost and security.*

---

* Mr. Suh (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

That also applies to such an important element as the United Nations Secretariat, and more specifically to the Office for Disarmament Affairs. We fully support the strengthening of the Office and welcome the efforts made by the Secretariat to that end: we especially welcome today's statement by Mr. Petrovsky on this subject.

We must obviously continue our thorough study of the report of the Secretary-General. Its various propositions require further serious work at State level and within the United Nations, at the Conference on Disarmament and so forth. Even preliminary analysis of the document shows that it already forms a solid foundation for work over a broad front in the sphere of multilateral disarmament. This frontal attack was last undertaken through the machinery of a special session, of itself a large-scale, one-off event. We think that it would be more important at the present juncture to undertake a proper organization of the process of analysis in common and the search for solutions, and to ensure the necessary continuity with the discussions in the First Committee. We would like at the same time to see the necessary coordination, and we would hope that the process would be businesslike, effective and non-discriminatory, so that everyone could make a specific contribution to it.

I do not think that we would be able today to solve all the issues, and therefore we think maximum use should be made of the remaining time before the end of this session of the First Committee to decide how we shall act in the so-called inter-session period.

Finally, we think that there is not much time to arrive at the right decisions, and in this connection I note the very important and interesting idea put forward by Ambassador Marín Bosch of Mexico, on the possibility of

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

holding an extended session of the First Committee, resuming its work some time in March, for example. We think that is a very interesting idea, and we are ready to study it with favour and attention.

Mr. FUJITA (Brazil): Like previous speakers, my delegation welcomes the opportunity to discuss the report of the Secretary-General on the new dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era (A/C.1/47/7). My delegation also thanks Mr. Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, for his interesting statement this morning. A warm word of appreciation is also in order for the members of the Secretariat who collaborated in the preparation of this interesting and timely document.

At the outset I should like to highlight a passage which for our delegation encapsulates the fulcrum of our task in the post-cold-war era:

> "Today there is a real opportunity to initiate a process of global disarmament. This should be closely coordinated with efforts in other fields and should be seen as part of the larger network of international cooperative behaviour which is designed to safeguard the security of all nations. Disarmament, the structuring of a new system of international relations and improving economic conditions should be regarded as complementary measures and as far as possible should be implemented in a coordinated manner." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 10)

In this regard, my delegation has expressed - during last year's general debate in the First Committee and again this year - the view that disarmament, democratization of international relations and development should be the three main foundations of a new structure for peace.

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

Like other delegations, I would like to address the three concepts of integration, globalization and revitalization contained in the document of the Secretary-General. My delegation agrees with the general thrust of the interesting framework represented in the report. However, we think that the concepts it contains must be further refined.

Starting with integration, we believe that this concept should translate into a positive correlation between disarmament, democratization of international relations and development. We fully agree that the world is still a dangerous place, despite recent improvements in the international environment. Proliferation of dangerous weapons, the new momentum in trade in weapons and the still high level of military expenditures are far too excessive in relation to unmet human needs. World military expenditures are in the order of a trillion dollars. Eighty per cent originate in the more advanced industrial countries; considering the population ratio between industrialized and developing countries, the disproportion in military expenditures both in absolute terms and on a per capita basis is still very great.

This picture is further aggravated in that most of the arms acquired by the developing countries originate in a few advanced industrialized countries, which seem to find difficulty in curtailing or restraining such transfers. A drastic reduction in military expenditures of every country to a level of, say, 1 per cent or 2 per cent of respective gross national product, plus the urgent conversion of the military industries rendered useless by the end of the cold war, would channel much needed resources for international development.

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

We agree that disarmament efforts should not be abandoned now that the cold war is over. On the contrary, the end of global confrontation should help accelerate disarmament, in relation both to the huge arsenals built up in the context of the competition of the cold war and to the regional arms races. The relationship of disarmament and international security should thus be a reciprocally stimulating one.

We note the parallel in the report between disarmament measures and conflict resolution, as well as the relationship between disarmament and preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping. We find that parallel very interesting and very stimulating. Disarmament, however, since it involves fundamental national security issues and very complex technical factors, has to be thoroughly and carefully negotiated. On the one hand, only through negotiations can legitimacy in disarmament be acquired. On the other hand, the process, which, from verification to destruction, is technically very intricate, calls for very careful consideration of all the details by all the parties involved, whatever their level of armament.

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

As the recently concluded negotiations on a chemical weapons Convention have indicated, disarmament requires a complex and specialized machinery, for both the negotiation and the implementation phases. Therefore, as the report duly underlines, disarmament measures within the framework of peace enforcement are distinct from the process of disarmament through negotiation. This confirms that, while there may be similarities, the process of disarmament and the techniques used in the context of possible peacemaking, peace-keeping and peace enforcement measures should not be confused. In brief, the topic of integration of disarmament and arms limitation issues into the international peace and security agenda deserves careful thought.

I now turn to the concept of globalization. It is our belief that that concept should translate into a true commitment to multilateral negotiations for arms limitation and disarmament. Although unilateral and bilateral initiatives are to be praised, it is only through multilaterally negotiated documents that are binding, verifiable and non-discriminatory that the international community can feel secure at the lowest possible level of armaments.

As to the concept of revitalization, my delegation believes that it should translate into a genuine building of a new system of international security free of all weapons of mass destruction, of all possibility of their proliferation and of unwarranted arms production and transfers in excess of legitimate needs for them.

We note the importance attached in the report to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In this regard, while we take note of that reference, we would also like to point out there are other non-proliferation treaties, with more than sufficient verification procedures,

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

which can assure the international community of a State's peaceful intentions regarding its domestic nuclear programme. This is the case, for instance, of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which we hope will be in full force in the region in the near future after the adoption of amendments to the text proposed by Argentina, Chile, Mexico and Brazil, and approved by the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL).

We must urgently evolve towards a post-nuclear-weapons age through the prohibition of the use, development, production and stockpiling of all weapons of mass destruction. By eliminating all existing weapons of mass destruction, we shall be able to go beyond the partial logic of non-proliferation. Like the chemical weapons Convention, which completely eliminates a whole existing category of weapons on a universal, non-discriminatory, verifiable and equitable basis, without unduly hampering the peaceful uses of science and technology, we must now aim to formulate a similar instrument in the field of nuclear weapons.

An important point also in this connection is the need to preserve the peaceful uses of science and technology while preventing proliferation, as recognized in paragraph 29 of the Secretary-General's report. This constitutes, in essence, the heart of the Brazilian proposal submitted to the Disarmament Commission, which is currently on its agenda.

As to conventional arms, the report rightly notes that

> "Production overcapacities and surplus equipment in industrialized States are now increasingly feeding arms markets in parts of the developing world." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 30)

The lost "opportunity costs" caused by such transfers are incurred not only by developing countries, which spend on armaments resources needed in other

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

sectors of their societies, but also by industrialized countries, which misallocate human and technological resources that are much needed in an ever more competitive civilian world economy.

As the report notes:

"the existence of huge military production capacities makes disarmament an uncertain development. ... In many countries, in particular, economically advanced ones, there are large segments of the population dependent on military production. ... The arms industry and the military establishment, which usually enjoy considerable privileges, will resist changes." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 39)

This is indeed cause for deep concern by the international community, and makes an even stronger case for an urgent common effort towards a post-nuclear-weapons age beyond the partial logic of non-proliferation. In this regard, while welcoming the establishment of the United Nations Register and its speedy implementation, we hold that transparency is no substitute for reduction in arms.

I have a final word to say about machinery. The report mentions the need for a coordinated system that would allow the international community to address major disarmament problems promptly, flexibly and efficiently. In the view of my delegation, such machinery is already in place within the United Nations system. What is not yet in place is the necessary political will to make it work. Like the Security Council, which for a long time did not work adequately because of a lack of political will, the existing forums of the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, each with its own characteristics, mandate and function, should be able to address any major disarmament problems as soon as the necessary political will

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

exists.

As to the suggestions on the possible role of the Security Council in disarmament matters, my delegation believes that any discussion on Security Council action in the field of disarmament should be undertaken carefully, strictly within the purview defined in the Charter of the United Nations. In this regard, we also note that the report rightly points out that

> "The use of disarmament measures within the framework of peace enforcement is quite distinct from the process of disarmament through negotiation, which several States and elements of the international community have been pursuing for years. The two should never be confused... ." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 13)

In conclusion, my delegation once again welcomes the discussion we are undertaking today on the report of the Secretary-General. It is the belief of the Brazilian delegation that this discussion marks the beginning of a deep and thorough dialogue among the Members of the United Nations on the ways and means to address new challenges, as well as the old challenges that still remain in the field of disarmament.

Mr. BIVERO (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): Our delegation appreciates this opportunity for an exchange of views. As we stated in the general debate in the First Committee, in spite of the significant progress in some areas of arms limitation and reduction and disarmament, new threats and challenges have arisen for the international community. These new developments, combined with the sequels to the arms race in all its forms, particularly in the field of nuclear weapons, require us to continue to attach the utmost importance to disarmament-related issues and, no doubt, to consider whether we need to adapt our expectations. We therefore

(Mr. Bivero, Venezuela)

appreciate this opportunity to consider what practical, realistic measures might be relevant with regard to disarmament in the near future, and what procedure should be followed for the discussion of these measures. The views and priorities expressed by a large majority of countries at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly illustrate the diversity of opinion that exists and the interest in discussing these issues in an open and constructive way.

(Mr. Bivero, Venezuela)

The present response, in our view, is that our efforts must not be aimed at establishing a new disarmament programme, but rather that we should explore ways and means of achieving agreements in an expeditious way on the various subjects already under consideration, placing emphasis on those issues we have agreed to identify as being of greatest urgency.

There is no doubt that the adoption of measures aimed at arms reduction and limitation and disarmament plays an important role in strengthening international peace and security as was reflected explicitly in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament as long ago as 1978.

The arms race, with its serious implications for international security, justifiably led to an urgent task for all countries, calling for special studies to determine its specific characteristics, including related issues, as well as appropriate mechanisms to deal with all questions related to disarmament matters.

In our view, the task remains important and we are now witnessing the results of this undertaking. The following achievements deserve mention: the consensus achieved within the framework of the Disarmament Commission on various questions and, more recently, the success of the Conference on Disarmament in concluding negotiations on the Convention on Chemical Weapons.

On the basis of these considerations, we believe it appropriate to make a few comments and to pose a few questions of a preliminary nature on the report of the Secretary-General, submitted to the Committee during Disarmament Week, entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era".

(Mr. Bivero, Venezuela)

First of all, the very title of the report raises certain criteria that merit consideration, for it announces the existence of "new dimensions in the sphere of disarmament" and establishes "arms regulations" as a priority. In our view, both criteria affect the nature and the scope of disarmament as we have thus far understood it.

We wish at this stage to make some preliminary comments in connection with the three areas suggested in the report: integration, globalization and revitalization for the future consideration of disarmament issues.

In connection with integration, we believe it relevant to study in further detail the significance and the scope of the concept contained in paragraph 4, which states:

> "Problems in this field" - that of disarmament - "can be resolved only in conjunction with other political and economic issues, while solutions to political and economic issues are often found in conjunction with disarmament measures." (A/C.1/47/7)

Although the report refers to the joint solution of such issues, we note that no mention is made of the relationship between disarmament and development. In our view, progress in the field of disarmament could lead to a review of the action programme adopted during the Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in 1987. Hence, it is appropriate to continue efforts to allocate some of the resources released by disarmament to social and economic sustainable development, as well as the other purposes not considered at that Conference, in particular, the protection of the environment.

In principle, we are pleased at the comments on conversion of military industry to civilian purposes.

(Mr. Bivero, Venezuela)

I turn now to section II, entitled "Globalization. Enhancing the Multilateral Approach". In highlighting a regional approach to disarmament the Secretary-General places special emphasis on the conventional arms race, glossing over the proposals and efforts on other categories of weapons, particularly those to establish zones free of nuclear weapons and of weapons of mass destruction, as well as other initiatives. We believe it is both appropriate and timely to continue to give the same attention to each one of these initiatives, in keeping with the situations and the security interests of the countries of the region concerned.

Neither does the report deal with the subject of the dangers inherent in the transfer of the arms race to outer space. That subject has been on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament and certain proposals have been made designed to fill the gaps in the present regime governing activities in outer space.

Another question that remains relevant in disarmament-related issues is the need to achieve, as soon as possible, a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing, the only way to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. What has been called the step-by-step approach, which is reflected in paragraph 25 of the report, suggests as desirable the maintenance of the monopoly of nuclear arsenals and their qualitative improvement in accordance with the "minimum nuclear deterrence" theory.

Venezuela feels that the international community should insist on further work aimed at putting an end to the cycle of production and development of nuclear weapons, including the testing stage, which has not lost any validity.

(Mr. Bivero, Venezuela)

Hence, we need to avail ourselves of the progress achieved in certain disarmament spheres in order to devote further attention to this subject in the Conference on Disarmament - and this, too, is not mentioned in the report now before us.

Neither is mention made of the Review Conference of the Partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963, whose work is fundamental to preventing the continuation of nuclear testing.

As long as nuclear weapons and the desire to improve them exist, and as long as they can be acquired by other countries, it will be appropriate, on the basis of reciprocal and non-discriminatory principles and through universal application, to strengthen the international regime in the existing Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We are not convinced by the idea of an unconditional and indefinite extension of the NPT, as proposed in the report, because this could lead to lack of balance affecting the validity of the Treaty. Its extension should be aimed at achieving a commitment that makes it possible to strengthen the NPT and to induce other States to become parties to it. Unless and until that goal is achieved, nuclear-weapon States should commit themselves to adopting effective and convincing measures to prevent the use or threat of use of such weapons.

Neither does the report mention problems deriving from scientific and technological advances in tne development of new and more sophisticated weapons and weapons systems, with their consequent effect on international security.

We believe that the section devoted to arms transfers only partially addresses the issue. In focusing on regional measures to limit such

(Mr. Bivero, Venezuela)

transfers, it fails to take into account clearly enough the role of producers and suppliers, nor the possibility of restrictions being placed on exporters.

Lastly, we would like to express our concern at the lack of mention of the work of the Disarmament Commission and of the First Committee as organs entrusted with considering disarmament issues, including the interrelationship of these two organs and the Conference on Disarmament.

We are also concerned about the implications of this entire approach on the work and the future of the Office of Disarmament Affairs. None the less, we are grateful for the complementary observations made here today by the Under-Secretary-General.

In conclusion, we trust that the Committee will have the opportunity to continue studying all of these questions thoroughly, so that the efforts of the United Nations will enable us to maintain an integral and interrelated approach to disarmament problems and make progress towards their solution in keeping with the dimensions of the subject.

Mr. RIVERO ROSARIO (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Cuba would like, first of all, to thank the Chairman of the First Committee for enabling the Committee to devote a meeting to consideration of the report submitted to us by the Secretary-General under agenda item 63 (f). This report, which is contained in document A/C.1/47/7, is entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era". In this context, the presence of Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky at our meeting is a positive sign and will undoubtedly help to make the Secretary-General aware of the reaction of the Member States represented in the Committee to the points raised in the document.

Once again the Secretary-General, on his own initiative, has submitted to us proposals of great importance that require thorough and careful analysis. I should like briefly to express the preliminary views of the delegation of Cuba on some of the questions raised in the report we are considering.

A simple glance at the document enables us to arrive at an immediate conclusion: that, while this meeting is intended to make it possible for us to express a few views on the report, proper consideration of the content, scope and meaning of the ideas put forward in it requires a much wider framework. My delegation would therefore like to propose that the report prepared by the Secretary-General be sent to Member States and that they be asked to express their opinions. Once their replies have been received, this exercise might lead to the establishment of a working group open to all interested delegations, to consider the opinions of States with a view to arriving at conclusions and assessments for subsequent discussion by the First Committee.

It would also be appropriate to send the report to the Conference on Disarmament for study in that multilateral negotiating forum, which could then submit its conclusions to the General Assembly.

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

With regard to the contents of the document, we shall confine our preliminary statement to a few points. We shall not at this stage try to deal with all the issues that certainly warrant comment.

One of the paragraphs of the introduction to the report, referring to the need to strengthen international peace and security, states that problems in this field can be resolved only in conjunction with other political and economic issues and that solutions to political and economic issues are often found in conjunction with disarmament measures (A/C.1/47/7, para. 4). We agree in essence with this idea, which in our opinion corroborates what many delegations have said about the link between peace, international security and the solution of political and economic problems.

None the less, apart from mention of the conversion, applicable above all to arms-producing countries, we could not find in the following paragraphs of the report any reflection of the view that this linkage can help to solve the grave and urgent problems now confronting the great majority of the States Members of the Organization - the developing countries. In this respect, it is striking that the link between disarmament and development and the principles established by the international community in the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in 1987, are not mentioned.

The chapter of the report that deals with integration refers to the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace". In this connection, there is mention of three innovative concepts for the solution of conflicts: preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping. The report states that these can be strengthened by concrete measures of arms regulation and disarmament. This idea requires further thought to enable us to arrive at a

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

conclusion, but it is evident that an analysis of this type cannot be partial in nature. We recall that the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" is being considered thoroughly by an open-ended Working Group of the General Assembly. The delegation of Cuba wonders whether the ideas to which I have referred should not be studied in conjunction with that report.

In the chapter on globalization the report mentions the need to broaden disarmament efforts to include multilateral arrangements as well as bilateral agreements, with the participation of all States. It is indicated that too often, in order to avoid disarmament measures, some States argue that the major military Powers should disarm first, and the report states that that argument is no longer valid. The delegation of Cuba believes that security and other considerations that lead to a State's making a sovereign decision not to participate in a given disarmament measure ought to be regarded as aspects of the exercise of sovereignty. We must therefore take account of reasoning that goes beyond what is put forward here.

We recognize that, as has been agreed, all States must make a contribution to efforts to achieve disarmament. But, at the same time, we believe that the nuclear-weapon States and the States with large military arsenals have a special responsibility. While important disarmament agreements have been secured in recent years, it seems to my delegation that a level of arms reduction that would make it possible to put these States on an equal footing with the other members of the international community has not been achieved.

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

In the chapter on revitalization the report records what has been achieved recently - in the nuclear field, for example. It mentions aspirations and objectives that the delegation of Cuba shares completely - such as the need for a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon testing and the elimination of all nuclear weapons. But these aspirations are not translated into concrete proposals for action in the report.

A few paragraphs later the report deals with chemical weapons. There, we do not see a clear conclusion as to the origin of the statement that currently 20 States possess or seek to acquire a chemical weapons capability. It would certainly be helpful if we knew the source of this information. We have not found it in any United Nations document.

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

It is significant that in referring to proliferation control the report says that there can be no justification for any State, anywhere, to acquire the tools and technologies of mass destruction, but that it makes no mention of what is commonly termed vertical proliferation. My delegation wonders whether there is any justification, or whether there is an attempted justification, for the fact that certain States continue to possess instruments and technologies of mass destruction - for example, in the nuclear sphere.

In referring to the non-proliferation Treaty, the report recognizes that it has contentious aspects. My country is not a Party to the Treaty, for reasons that have been clearly explained. But when the report states that when the Treaty comes up for extension in 1995, it should be extended indefinitely and unconditionally we wonder whether that is not prejudging the work to be done by the preparatory committee that is to be set up and by the Conference itself, including the possibility of an exchange of views between the Parties to the Treaty and non-Parties, with a view to the possible improvement and full universality of the Treaty?

I have a few brief comments about the conclusion. My delegation is struck by its very title, since it appears that new tasks will replace the tasks and goals we have set for ourselves in the past and have not yet achieved.

There is mention of new machinery and the attention it should give to the new realities and priorities. It is quite clear to my delegation what the new priorities are. Even in the context of the new realities, for the great majority of countries they are still the same; indeed, they

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

are even more pressing than they were in the past, apart from the fact that the peace to which our peoples aspire has not been achieved. Our priorities are still those agreed by consensus, unanimously, in 1978, at the tenth special session of the General Assembly, which, incredibly, has been glossed over in the report.

The Secretary-General is in favour of greater Security Council involvement in disarmament matters, and in particular in the enforcement of non-proliferation. There is no need to recall that in some of its Articles the Charter gives a mandate to the Security Council in arms control and disarmament matters, in which it should have the assistance of the Military Staff Committee, but it should be noted that it has no blank cheque in this respect, and that the General Assembly, the most important organ of the United Nations, not only is called upon to maintain and increase its role in this area, but is also charged with examining the Security Council's activities. Therefore, my delegation does not see clearly the future role of our First Committee as a political and decision-making body in the field of multilateral disarmament. The report indicates that the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament should be focused on well-defined and urgent issues. Our delegation wonders whether, for example, the nuclear items on its agenda are not questions of such a nature.

It is also suggested that the present negotiating body become a sort of supervisory body for what are called existing multilateral regulations. My delegation does not share the view that the Conference on Disarmament should cease to be the single multilateral negotiating forum in the field of disarmament, and that it should in this way give up its

(Mr. Rivero Rosario, Cuba)

task in the search for new international instruments in this sphere, or that it could take the place of the review conferences of various treaties and conventions, which are held as often as the respective States parties decide. We feel that it would undoubtedly be more appropriate to allow the Conference on Disarmament and its members to decide on those issues that fall within their sphere of competence.

In proposing new machinery, the report omits any mention of the deliberative body in which all Members of the United Nations participate, the Disarmament Commission, which our delegation believes plays an important role.

Those are the preliminary views that the Cuban delegation wished to express now, without prejudice to our expressing our views to the Secretary-General at the appropriate time. We repeat that Member States should be asked to express their opinions on the report, and that an appropriate forum should be established for the consideration of those opinions.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): My delegation would like to join other delegations in thanking the Chairman for convening this meeting to consider the Secretary-General's report on new dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era. We congratulate the Secretary-General on his initiative in putting forward many interesting ideas in a report which will no doubt focus the attention of Member States on the many interlinked issues involved. The report could thus well become the catalyst for an intensive examination in capitals, as well as in the First Committee, in the Conference on Disarmament and elsewhere.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

Many preliminary ideas, however, spring to one's mind. First and foremost is the growing interlinkage between preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and peace-building in a post-cold war world where arms regulation and disarmament must inevitably go hand in hand with the removal of the underlying causes of tensions and conflicts, whether they have their roots in unresolved disputes in ethnic disequilibrium or in the outright hegemonistic domination of peoples in territories recognized as having a legitimate right to self-determination.

Another interesting linkage is between the global disarmament agenda and the regional disarmament agenda, both in weapons of mass destruction and in the much more pervasive destabilizing acquisition of conventional arms well beyond the requirements of legitimate national defence.

The third interlinkage lies in the interrelationship between different organs with overlapping responsibilities in the field of disarmament and security - the well-known trio of the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission in New York and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva - as well as the increasing role now being played by the Security Council, and, as the current report shows, by the Secretary-General himself.

All these are issues of great import and substance, and they require consideration in a more relaxed atmosphere than exists one day before voting is to start in the First Committee on disarmament draft resolutions.

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

My delegation would therefore like to propose two simultaneous and parallel courses of action. The first would be to hold a special session of the First Committee to be devoted entirely to the consideration of these important issues. The second would be to invite Member States to give their considered views in writing on the ideas contained in the Secretary-General's report.

The overall purpose of both would be to examine the traditional concepts of disarmament and security to see which parts have continuing validity and which might have been overtaken by new developments; to identify what is achievable in the disarmament agenda in a specific time frame over the next few years; to clear possible confusion about the roles and responsibilities of various overlapping organs; and to do all this by encouraging all Member States to participate actively in making known their views on this subject.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria): Before I address the subject of our meeting today, I wish, on behalf of the delegation of Bulgaria, to welcome the important statement made at the outset of this meeting by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, who has highlighted the issues analysed in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7). My delegation takes his keen interest in our discussion as a clear indication of the determination of the Secretariat to preserve the viability of the United Nations disarmament machinery while adapting it to the new realities of a changing world.

The delegation of Bulgaria has already had more than one opportunity to welcome the submission of Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's report concerning new dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament, which he introduced in this Committee.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

We have studied the report of the Secretary-General and have been able to confirm our initial impression that his new initiative is a timely and adequate response to the widely shared wish of Member States that a decisive impetus should be given to the arms control activities within the United Nations from the perspective of a new vision of its role and important place in efforts to strengthen international peace, security and stability.

In our view, the report on new dimensions fulfils these expectations. It represents a concrete development of the vision of change and reinforcement of the United Nations that the Secretary-General outlined in his famous report entitled "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277).

Delegations addressing the new report of the Secretary-General in this Committee have already referred to it as "An Agenda for Peace Part II" or as "An Arms Control Agenda for Peace". We take this as a reflection of the fundamental importance of the Secretary-General's attempt to explore in this report the new dimensions of arms negotiation and disarmament in a changing world.

The delegation of Bulgaria shares the view expressed in the report of the Secretary-General that disarmament is centrally relevant to international security needs. It is, indeed, one of the basic pillars of global efforts to maintain peace and security. As Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali rightly pointed out in his introductory address,

> "... the end of bipolarity has not diminished the need for disarmament; if anything, it has increased it". (A/C.1/47/PV.18, p.13)

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

In this respect, I wish also to recall the equally valid point made by Mr. Petrovsky in his opening statement at the beginning of this session of the First Committee that:

> "... it is a most welcome development that disarmament is now more than ever regarded as one of the key elements in the integrated approach to international peace and security ...". (A/C.1/47/PV.3, p. 9-10)

My delegation fully agrees that the three concepts suggested by the Secretary-General in his report on new dimensions - integration, globalization and revitalization - can be the foundation stones for an enhanced international effort in the field of disarmament and arms regulation. Like him, we see these three dimensions of reassessment as something which may not be fundamentally novel but is still very much needed at this particular moment in history. What is certainly novel in trying to adapt the tasks of arms control to the new political environment is the new content of these three concepts, which have been introduced at a time when they seem achievable if concerted and well-focused actions are taken.

My delegation fully shares the Secretary-General's understanding that:

> "We must also move away from the idea that disarmament is a subject for negotiations alone. It is also an area for action through self-restraint, mutual example and public awareness of the costs and benefits of weapons acquisition". (A/C.1/47/PV.18, p. 13)

To this, we can add only our belief that such a course of action by Member States opens an extremely important avenue for building confidence, thus contributing to greater stability and common security in the world.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

I wish to reaffirm my delegation's expectation - mentioned in the same context on a previous occasion - that the rich conceptual basis provided by the Secretary-General's report on new dimensions will be followed by actions undertaken both by Governments and by the Secretariat to stabilize the institutions supporting arms-control-related activities as seen from the new perspective.*

With reference to the concluding part of the Secretary-General's report, I wish to indicate that my delegation also feels that the United Nations is confronted today with an entirely new set of problems rightly referred to as post-disarmament issues. The correlation between disarmament measures and economic conditions has indeed drawn more attention over recent years as democratic trends influence development.

These emerging issues highlight the immediate need for post-disarmament efforts as economies and Governments try to transform military-oriented industrial complexes into enterprises serving social, humanitarian and development requirements. Eastern European countries, which are now undergoing a major transition from centrally planned to free-market economies, particularly feel the urgency of dealing with these new challenges.

In this context, the Secretary-General's report correctly points to the three major problems that stand out in terms of their urgency and complexity: the safe destruction and storage of armaments consequent to disarmament agreements; the conversion of military capacity to peaceful uses; and the provision of adequate technical and financial resources to complete the transition in a balanced manner.

---

* The Chairman took the Chair.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

My delegation has been happy to read in the Secretary-General's report that the United Nations is ready to assist in exploring these concepts. Yes, we believe that the Organization is an appropriate forum for fostering dialogue on this matter so that effective ways can be found to deal with it. We agree with the view expressed in the report that advanced economies must share their expertise and experience with other nations.

I wish to mention that Bulgaria, like other Eastern European countries in transition, has already embarked on the difficult process of dealing with issues relating to the conversion of military industry to civilian purposes as part of the dialogue going on within the North Atlantic Cooperation Council. My Government values also conversion-related bilateral contacts with countries with experience and an active interest in exploring the possibilities for establishing joint ventures or other kinds of cooperation of mutual interest.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

Bulgaria looks forward to benefiting from the forms of cooperation that could be developed within the global mechanisms of the United Nations. In that context, the delegation of Bulgaria cannot but support the Secretary-General's appeal to all Member States to consider methods to alleviate the problems arising from the painful transition to a post-disarmament world.

We have also noted with keen interest the information contained in the report on new dimensions, that the Secretary-General is establishing an interdepartmental task force at the United Nations to provide Member States with political, technical and economic advice on the various aspects of that transition. My delegation looks forward to the first substantive results of that important group.

With regard to that portion of the report dealing with the new machinery of disarmament, my delegation starts from the same premise as the Secretary-General. Because the United Nations was created during the cold war, its machinery should be reassessed to meet the realities and priorities of our time. My delegation agrees that we now need a coordinated system which would allow the international community to address major disarmament problems promptly, flexibly and efficiently.

Bulgaria has already had the opportunity to express its support for the idea of greater Security Council involvement in disarmament matters, in particular in the enforcement of the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We view this suggestion as a part of the overall reform of the United Nations, which has many interrelated aspects.

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

It is our earnest hope also that in the course of introducing the necessary institutional changes, full use will be made of the expertise and rich experience of the Secretariat units that have been dealing successfully with arms control and disarmament. We believe that the Secretariat should continue to serve, equally, effectively and efficiently, the various needs that Member States may have with respect to promoting priority measures in this important area.

My Government endorses the Secretary-General's efforts to restructure the Secretariat and to make it more efficient. Within the context of those efforts, I know that it is the strong belief of a number of Member States, including Bulgaria, that the reorganized Office for Disarmament Affairs will be adequately staffed to permit it not only to develop and operate the United Nations arms Register and the disarmament data base, but also to carry out efficiently its other priority tasks in the field of disarmament. In this connection, my delegation welcomes the commitment stated today in the statement of Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky that the Office for Disarmament Affairs will be strengthened and will continue to serve as a focal point for United Nations activities in the field of arms control and disarmament.

In conclusion, I wish to express again the full support of the delegation of Bulgaria for the endeavours of the Secretary-General to make the United Nations an organization which is better equipped to meet adequately the new challenges of the post-cold-war era. We share the vision of the Secretary-General's vision that in today's world societies can no longer afford to solve problems by the use of force. Along with him, we believe

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

that all the aims and priorities discussed in the report on new dimensions are indeed practical and attainable; none seems Utopian. In international politics disarmament is one of the most important means of reducing violence in relations between States.

If I may quote the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Stoyan Ganev, who is also Foreign Minister of my country,

> "we should rededicate our efforts to completing the unfinished arms-control agenda and to defining the outline of a new agenda commensurate with the magnitude of the problems at hand".
>
> (A/C.1/47/PV.18, p. 8)

The delegation of Bulgaria considers the report of the Secretary-General dealing with the new dimensions of arms control and disarmament to be an important contribution to this end. With that in mind, we believe that the report should be given wider distribution, perhaps as a separate publication, so that a larger constituency of interested readers can become better acquainted with its analysis and recommendations with respect to how disarmament activities and their machinery should be changed and strengthened in line with the new requirements of our time.

Mr. NAIMI-ARFA (Islamic Republic of Iran): Let me begin, Mr. Chairman, by expressing my appreciation to you for convening this special meeting of the First Committee, as well as to the Secretary-General for his report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era", which was circulated in observance of Disarmament Week. I wish also to thank Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky for his important statement this morning.

(Mr. Naimi-Arfa, Islamic Republic of Iran)

The report of the Secretary-General clearly sets out new ideas and approaches in the area of disarmament and international security which deserve to be considered very carefully by Member States. Indeed, now that the international community is aspiring to move towards a new era of enhanced global security and tranquility, and now that global efforts in the area of arms control and international security are continuing to show promising signs, we need to develop new ways of thinking to solidify international peace and security. In that context, we have noted that the Secretary-General indicates in his report that there are three concepts that can serve as foundation-stones on which to build enhanced international efforts towards disarmament and arms regulation: integration, globalization and revitalization. Let me make several preliminary observations concerning those three concepts.

As regards integration, we agree with the Secretary-General that disarmament, the restructuring of a new system of international relations and the improvement of economic conditions should be regarded as complementary measures and, as far as possible, should be implemented in a coordinated manner. My delegation has expounded its views on this matter on numerous occasions. We believe that, as part of any genuine effort to strengthen arms control and disarmament, the destabilizing effects of the widening North-South gap must be taken into account and addressed, with a balanced and integrated approach.

With respect to the concept of globalization, it needs to be stressed that it is in the interest of all States to extend disarmament efforts to

(Mr. Naimi-Arfa, Islamic Republic of Iran)

include not only bilateral agreements but also multilateral agreements as part of a world-wide process involving all States. In addition, we believe that, as the Secretary-General emphasizes in his report. the United Nations system can play a much more significant role in the globalization of disarmament. In this regard, two points are of particular importance.

First, one should not lose sight of the responsibility that rests with nuclear-weapon States to make the world a safer place for all mankind by accelerating their efforts towards the reduction and ultimate elimination of nuclear arsenals from the face of the Earth.

Secondly, with regard to the role of the United Nations, we agree with the Secretary-General's observation in his report "An Agenda for Peace" that

> "Democracy within the family of nations ... requires the fullest consultation, participation and engagement of all States, large and small, in the work of the Organization". (A/47/277, para. 82)

(Mr. Naimi-Arfa, Islamic Republic of Iran)

We therefore strongly support the greater involvement of the General Assembly, and of the First Committee as one of its main organs, in disarmament and international security issues. Indeed, democratization and transparency are among the major characteristics of the emerging international system. Therefore the General Assembly, comprised of representatives of all Member States, is entitled to consider all problems of common concern to the international community and should not be even nominally sidelined in cases of international peace and security, including disarmament matters.

With regard to the concept of revitalization, there is a general interest among Member States to build on the success of past achievements. However, my delegation also recognizes that such past achievements can be further strengthened by embracing a forward-looking and all-encompassing approach. For instance, the non-proliferation Treaty can be further strengthened by removing its shortcomings as expeditiously as possible.

We have noted the importance of the Secretary-General's observations concerning nuclear disarmament. Nevertheless, several other issues need to be addressed in a more immediate fashion, consonant with the legitimate security interests of non-nuclear-weapon States. I will confine myself to highlighting briefly only two of them.

First, the logic of nuclear doctrines and the possession or acquisition of nuclear weapons should be closely examined by the international community. As my delegation underscored in its statement during the general debate in the First Committee, the time has come to reinvigorate the efforts of the past decade to delegitimize the possession or use of nuclear weapons under international law.

(Mr. Naimi-Arfa, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Secondly, greater importance should be attached to the most well-defined priorities on the nuclear disarmament agenda, including negative security assurances and a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing.

In conclusion, given the interest shown by representatives with regard to the issues at hand and in the light of the fact that several important elements have not been touched upon in this report, I wish to propose that a group of friends of the Chairman, or a working group of the First Committee should be established which could meet as necessary between now and the end of the next session of the General Assembly to explore this subject-matter more thoroughly.

The meeting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3.25 p.m.

Mr. HOU Zhitong (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I wish to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening this special meeting today. Earlier today, we heard some very important statements by delegations, and I should also like to make some preliminary comments.

I wish to thank the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros-Ghali, for attending the 18th meeting, held on the occasion of Disarmament Week, and for the important statement he made on that occasion. His report on new dimensions of disarmament (A/C.1/47/7), in which some new concepts were presented, has generated widespread interest and discussion.

We also very much appreciate Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky's attendance at this meeting, as well as his statement.

All of this is a source of great encouragement to us, because these important questions have given rise to in-depth discussion in the international community. This indicates that the inauguration of Disarmament Week was one of the key decisions taken at the tenth special session on disarmament. It demonstrates that the Secretary-General, like the international community, continues to attach importance to the decisions taken at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and also to the full implementation of its Final Act. It also demonstrates the international community's growing concern about disarmament issues and shows that the international community, faced with a new situation, requires not only an agenda for peace but also an agenda for disarmament and arms control, just as it also needs an agenda for development. All of these strategies and agendas are interrelated and indivisible.

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

I also wish to make some comments on the question of integration raised by the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General correctly points out the close interrelationship between disarmament and international peace and security. We concur with this presentation and this point of view. Facts have shown that although the cold war has come to an end, the task of safeguarding international peace and security has not disappeared.

Arms control and disarmament face new challenges. Disarmament and peace and security are indivisible. We cannot have one without the other, nor can we put them in confrontation. We should handle and resolve these issues in an integrated manner.

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

It is my delegation's understanding that the primary responsibilities of the United Nations under the Charter are the maintenance of international peace and security and the promotion of common development and cooperation. All that we are doing in the disarmament field is in the service of these important objectives, be it in the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission or the Conference on Disarmament. In this regard, we have made contributions but there are more contributions to be made in the future.

It is also our understanding that disarmament has always been an indispensable element of peace and security. Without disarmament and arms control, there can be no international peace and security, and there can be no disarmament or arms control without peace and security.

In our view, the resolution of hot-spot issues and regional conflicts, the effecting of cease-fires and the continuance of peace-keeping activities are all, naturally, important elements of peace and security. However, they are not everything. Disarmament and arms control also need to occupy an important place.

In carrying out the foregoing activities we cannot depart from disarmament and arms control. For the security of a State, just having a good firefighter is not enough. We have to resolve the question of security from a fundamental standpoint, so we have to eliminate all other sources of insecurity. We must also resolve the issue of long-term stability, construction and development. Therefore, peace-keeping and peacemaking cannot be separated from disarmament and arms control. Otherwise it is hard to conceive of a stable peace or enduring security.

Another point I wish to bring up is the question of the globalization of disramament, which the Secretary-General rightly addresses. Even though this is not a novel notion, it is necessary to reiterate it in current

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

circumstances and to interpret it comprehensively and correctly. The Chinese delegation is of the view that the objective of globalization should be to promote peace, security and development; whether in bilateral, regional or global disarmament activities, this should be one of the objectives.

Globalization should be conducive to promoting the establishment of a new international order in the post-cold-war era. Therefore, we should carry out the democratization of international relations. Since disarmament bears upon the security of States and regions, the whole international community should attach importance to it. All the States Members of the United Nations should participate on an equal footing in deliberations concerning disarmament and the resolution of problems in this area. We should especially stress that all countries, large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor, should have the right to participate on an equal basis in the resolution of problems. We should not allow a small number of strong and large countries to monopolize all such activities.

In talking about globalization, we feel that that should be one of the principal elements. In order to achieve such an objective, it is our view that we should not, in any sense, denigrate or ignore the role played by the United Nations and its organs, much less attempt to do away with those important organs. We should, through the process of reform, increase their efficiency and enhance their effectiveness so that they can become truly broad-based, authoritative and democratic world-wide disarmament forums.

The role of the First Committee of the General Assembly is important. As is well known, the role of the United Nations Disarmament Commission is also important. Particularly in the last few years, after undergoing reforms, it has made new contributions. The international community has new hopes for the Commission.

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

I wish to emphasize particularly that the importance of the Conference on Disarmament, as the sole multilateral negotiating body in the world, is even more obvious. The conclusion of negotiations on the chemical weapons Convention demonstrates that the Conference on Disarmament, far from having nothing to do after the cold war, has a lot of important work to carry out. We believe that, after the reasonable solution of the question of its expansion and following the improvement of its agenda, it will play an even greater role. We wish to express our appreciation for the work done by the Office for Disarmament Affairs. That constructive work should also receive widespread support.

I wish to emphasize that globalization should be conducive to the better implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly, including the resolutions and documents of the three special sessions devoted to disarmament, which address, among other things, the priorities in disarmament and arms control and the special responsibility borne by countries possessing the largest arsenals. We are pleased to point out that those countries possessing the largest nuclear arsenals have not claimed to have already done enough. They are prepared to continue to go forward, and there is much more to be done. Therefore, we have reason to believe that they will not make use of the presentation of the issue of globalization to evade their special responsibilities.

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

We believe that they will make further, necessary, greater contributions.

Finally, I wish to comment on the question of the reform of the United Nations disarmament bodies. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Qian Qichen, commented very fully on this issue in his statement during the general debate at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly (A/47/PV.8), but I wish to emphasize now that the so-called reform must be conducive to the maintenance of peace, security and development, because reform is a matter for the entire membership of the United Nations; it is not a matter solely for a small group of countries. Reform should be supported by the entire membership of the United Nations, and receive their understanding.

I also wish to point out that reform and rationalization are necessary, but that this is not a once-and-for-all matter, which will be an overnight success; it is something that is long-term and continuous. We should proceed cautiously. We are not going to be conservative, and we are not going to be complacent. We should not hope to achieve everything in one fell swoop. When we are carrying out reforms of the disarmament bodies, the important thing is to have an objective and comprehensive basic assessment. Therefore, we should carry out very specific reforms that really tackle the problems.

We also wish to consider whether it is important to carry out extensive surgery on a fairly healthy body. In the last fifty years, during which there have been many changes in the international situation, there has been no change to the Charter of the United Nations. The purposes, principles and role of the United Nations have not been changed: the practice of the United

(Mr. Hou Zhitong, China)

I am very happy to say that I have listened today to many constructive proposals from a number of delegations, and I wish to make a procedural proposal - that the Secretariat collate the important proposals and points of view which have been put forward by delegations today and distribute them to delegations for their further consideration. I should like, if possible, for us to have further meetings of this kind for the purpose of having more consultations in order that all of the bodies in the disarmament field may be able to play their due role.

Mr. SUH (Republic of Korea): On behalf of the delegation of the Republic of Korea, I would like to thank you for convening this special meeting of the First Committee to review the Secretary-General's report "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" (A/C.1/47/7).

As the title of the report implies, this new era of world history has provided us with new opportunities and new hope for progress in the field of arms control and disarmament. Clearly, as the Secretary-General pointed out in his statement before this Committee at the 18th meeting, disarmament is one of the foundation-stones for a peaceful world. However, we must also recognize that laying this most essential foundation-stone successfully will require the sincere cooperation of each and every member of the international community.

Conversely, if no country is willing to overlook self-interest for the benefit of all, if rhetoric and empty words are used in place of genuine commitment, then our task will amount to nothing more than an exercise in futility. If long-held positions developed during the cold war do not adapt

(Mr. Suh, Republic of Korea)

to this vastly different period in history, if fresh perspectives and objective viewpoints are not allowed to influence the work of the Organization, then our efforts are doomed from the very outset.

Given the critical - and perhaps fleeting - nature of this opportunity, the Secretary-General's recent reports are timely and significant. "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold war era" (A/C.1/47/7) and "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) have provided an effective impetus in initiating the adjustments necessary for the United Nations to succeed in a world completely different from that of only a few years ago.

In his report on arms control and disarmament, the Secretary-General has provided us with several thought-provoking concepts - integration, globalization and revitalization - which deserve our full consideration.

First, he has broadened the concept of international security by highlighting the links between disarmament and peace and security on the one hand and socio-economic progress on the other. As the report affirms,

> "Disarmament, the structuring of a new system of international relations and improving economic conditions should be regarded as complementary measures and...should be implemented in a coordinated manner." (A/C.1/47/7, para. 10).

This focus on the relationship between the underlying causes of instability and arms build-ups is long overdue. Consequently, we welcome the emphasis in the report on the integration between peace and security and the structuring of a new system of international cooperation.

Secondly, the Secretary-General has recognized the importance of regional arrangements as appropriate networks for implementing arms control and

(Mr. Suh, Republic of Korea)

confidence-building measures. As we have witnessed all too often, the welcome end of the cold war has unleashed a barrage of regional conflicts throughout the world, leaving new threats to the fledgling opportunities for peace. Therefore, regional approaches should be further strengthened, with the example set by the major military Powers now followed by the international community. We fully share the view of the Secretary-General that regional and subregional approaches can enhance the process of global arms reduction. Indeed, the significance of the regional approach not only can but should be placed on a par with that of the traditional global approach.

In the concluding section of his report, the Secretary-General focused with foresight on new problems which he labels "post-disarmament issues", particularly the "new machinery". We believe that in the light of the many implications which these emerging issues have for present and future disarmament efforts, they deserve to be fully considered by Member States as soon as possible.

The ball is now in the court of Member States. My delegation fully shares the view that "the time has come to proceed from exploratory discussions to practical actions" (A/C.1/47/7, para. 45), bearing in mind that the United Nations should be a place, not of deadlock, but of hope and inspiration.

In this regard, suggestions for review of the issue of arms control and disarmament in the post-cold-war era in a more comprehensive context on appropriate occasions merit our positive consideration, particularly in the light of the Secretary-General's report.

Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia): First of all, my delegation would like to thank the Secretary-General for his important statement introducing his report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era". I also wish to thank Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky for his interesting statement earlier in this meeting.

My delegation has read with care and interest the report of the Secretary-General on new dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era, which was submitted during Disarmament Week. We have noted the numerous proposals contained therein. Their implementation will have far-reaching ramifications for all Member States. Hence, they warrant careful scrutiny in the broader context of promoting our collective endeavours for disarmament and security. For that reason, my delegation wishes to offer some preliminary observations while reserving more detailed comments for a later stage.

My delegation fully agrees that a more effective strategy is needed to begin the process of reduction and elimination of armaments and of progressively strengthening international security. Undeniably, this is a complex, many-faceted relationship, and impinges directly on the problems of harmonizing the most fundamental and sensitive preoccupations with the most vital long-term interests of the global community. It can be highlighted, first, by acknowledging that arms build-up, the emergence of new weapons systems, and the refinement of existing systems and their proliferation have led to rivalry, tension and apprehension. Secondly, progress in disarmament would vastly increase the scope for international cooperation, particularly in fostering political and economic relations, and reinforce respect for the principles of national independence and sovereignty, equality and the right of

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

nations to determine their own destiny. Thirdly, disarmament would also facilitate the attainment of solutions to a number of critical problems, at the core of which is the interrelationship of security, disarmament and development.

Progress in disarmament is thus a sine qua non for strengthening security in all its aspects, including the non-military ones. Conversely, the question of security, in the narrow sense of the term, lies at the very heart of the disarmament process, and that relationship is largely determined by the intensity and pervasiveness that has long characterized the arms race.

One way out of this seemingly vicious circle is to have both disarmament and international security addressed simultaneously. Specific steps in one field would constitute a prerequisite for specific steps in the other. Parallelism and coordination of measures in both these fields represent the only logical and practical means to seek a solution to this problem. Such an approach does not, and cannot, imply any rigidity, for certain disarmament measures may not necessarily require simultaneous measures of a political or legal nature in order to strengthen international security. However, there are other disarmament measures that cannot be given effect without commensurate political and legal arrangements to strengthen security. The more far-reaching and the more militarily significant the disarmament measures are, the more need there is to coordinate them with measures to strengthen international security.

The interrelationship of disarmament and international security constitutes the very basis of many of the problems concerning progress in arms reductions and the maintenance of peace and security. Ultimately, the crux of the problem is to agree on modalities to ensure the security of States at

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

progressively lower levels of conventional armaments and with the total elimination of nuclear weapons. This would necessitate the mutual regulation, limitation and reduction of armaments, as well as the implementation of the collective security provisions of the Charter.

We do not share the view that issues of so-called strategic stability and verification pose formidable problems for nuclear disarmament. While nuclear doctrines have lost their relevance and applicability in the post-cold-war era, decisive progress has been achieved in the field of verification, provisions for which are now included so as to ensure compliance with agreements. We need only recall that the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty has been stymied owing to the lack of political will, rather than to questions of verification, which have long been resolved as a result of technological capabilities.

As a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), Indonesia recognizes the crucial need to maintain a viable regime for non-proliferation despite its shortcomings and asymmetrical obligations. But, also, we cannot be oblivious to the failure of some depositary States faithfully to fulfil the obligations undertaken in the Treaty. Hence, rather than extending the Treaty unconditionally and indefinitely, its longevity should be determined by a fresh appraisal of its functioning, especially in the areas of availability of nuclear materials, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes on an assured basis.

The report also calls for multilateral disarmament agreements to be implemented at the global, regional and subregional levels. Indonesia believes that these approaches should complement and reinforce one another. Progress at each level would contribute to the enhancement of the security of all States. Yet disarmament efforts in one region cannot be divorced from

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

disarmament efforts in other regions, as well as from global efforts, especially those involving the major Powers. At the same time, efforts towards the ultimate objective of general and complete disarmament cannot simply be regionally compartmentalized, with each region deciding on what can or cannot be achieved, since such an approach could distort global disarmament efforts and might result in imbalance in security, both for the States within a region and in relation to States outside the region.*

The report calls for greater involvement by the Security Council in disarmament questions and cites in that context the relevant provisions of the Charter. But it conspicuously omits reference to Article 11 of the Charter concerning the General Assembly's role in the formulation of principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments.

All Member States have a vital interest in the success of disarmament negotiations and a duty to contribute to efforts to limit armaments. To our profound dismay, however, the Conference on Disarmament has so far been prevented from effectively discharging its responsibilities on the items that have been accorded the highest priority. It can no longer be reduced to a body for mere debates on nuclear issues; rather, the Conference on Disarmament should open negotiations with the participation of all nuclear-weapon States on questions concerning nuclear disarmament.

Finally, the Non-Aligned Movement has approached the questions of disarmament and security on the basis of certain fundamental premises. First, the objective of seeking unilateral security through armaments is a dangerous

---

* Mr. Suh (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

illusion. Second, political objectives can no longer be achieved by military means. Third, the build-up of military power undermines rather than strengthens security. Fourth, neither qualitative improvements nor quantitative additions to weapons have reduced a State's vulnerability or led to absolute security. Fifth, security cannot be pursued at the cost of other countries, but rather should be pursued in concert with them. Sixth, a nuclear-weapons-free world, which alone can ensure human survival, is the collective responsibility of all nations.

These premises were emphatically affirmed at the Tenth Summit Conference of non-aligned countries, held in Jakarta last September. Based on these considerations, many non-aligned countries are committed to the effective implementation of collective security provisions as enshrined in the Charter.

The changed, and changing, international environment presents unprecedented possibilities, as well as challenges, for cooperation between nations. The need to integrate disarmament and security, the globalization of disarmament efforts and the revitalization of those efforts dealt with in the report, are among those new possiblities. My delegation will explore the various proposals and approaches that are likely to contribute to the collective interests of all States.

Let me conclude by stating that the Bulgarian proposal to have the Secretary-General's report circulated as a separate publication deserves our support.

Mr. AZIKIWE (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation welcomes the Secretary-General's report on "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era". The document complements the presentation in "An Agenda for Peace", particularly as it focuses on disarmament, a key element in any consideration of matters relating to international peace and security.

Disarmament has always enjoyed prominence in any political security organization. It is a vital element in confidence-building and it is a tool in building and securing peace. Although the cold war has ended, many of the weapons accumulated during that era still exist and are still exported and used in many regional conflicts.

Nigeria believes that disarmament should not only continue to enjoy prominence, but its unique and distinct character should be maintained and strengthened. Indeed, more than at any other time, those priority items identified in the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament have more relevance and should be vigorously pursued at the national, regional and global levels in order to achieve the ultimate goal of a safe and more secure world.

In the pursuit of this objective, we should continue to focus on weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons. We should move decisively to achieve a comprehensive test-ban treaty. This will ensure the continued viability of the non-proliferation Treaty regime.

Attention should also be devoted to conventional weapons, particularly the transfer of such arms to areas of tension and conflict. Arms producers have a moral obligation to restrain themselves in the sales of arms. Positive elements in international relations in the last five years have raised

(Mr. Azikiwe, Nigeria)

questions about the way international diplomacy is conducted. In particular, questions are being raised about the viability and vitality of disarmament machinery established during the cold war era. Nigeria believes that, ile the machinery of disarmament could be fine-tuned to reflect post-cold war developments, care should be taken not to unravel this machinery. We believe that the Committee should be given an opportunity to deliberate in detail on any change proposed in the machinery of disarmament.

The cost of peace is enormous, but it is insignificant compared with the cost of war. Disarmament is an instrument for peace. Hence any expenditure on disarmament should be seen as a peace investment. That is why the Nigerian delegation strongly calls for adequate funding of disarmament-related matters such as regional confidence-building measures and projects directed at non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): As a country which has always been in the forefront of the cause of disarmament, India will give serious consideration to the report of the Secretary-General. We greatly appreciate his effort in focusing on this issue in the context of the post-cold-war era. We would also like to thank Under-Secretary-General Petrovsky for his presentation and presence.

There are many elements in the report that immediately commend themselves. Among these are:

First, the thought that, despite the end of the cold war, disarmament is still relevant to international security as the world remains a dangerous place.

Second, the idea that all States should be engaged in the process of disarmament.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

Third, global and regional approaches have a role in arms control, but the types of proposals adopted in one region are not necessarily applicable to another. In this context we need to take note of the specific characteristics and security concerns of each region. We must also exercise due care in the definition of regions.

Fourth, the goal before us should be no less than the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, and there should be a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing with that end in mind. In fact, that is why India has always urged a negotiating mandate for the Conference on Disarmament in this regard.

Fifth, there is the continued importance and relevance of multilateral negotiating processes.

Sixth, there are concerns expressed on problems relating to arms transfers.

An even greater concern is, in our view, the nexus between illegal arms transfers and State-sponsored terrorist activities directed against other countries. Terrorism, especially of this kind, has today emerged as a disturbing threat to the stability and security of States. Regional disarmament can only come to full fruition if all States concerned fulfil their obligations under international law and refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts against other States.

In regard to the approaches to controlling proliferation, we are of the view that such controls should not divide the world into haves and have-nots. It is for this reason that we have advocated that rather than just extending the non-proliferation Treaty indefinitely and unconditionally, we should review and improve it, making it more equitable between nuclear-weapon

(Mr. Chandra, India)

States and non-nuclear-weapons States and thus turning it into an instrument for achieving the complete elimination of nuclear weapons leading to a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world.

As of now, disarmament is not on the agenda of the Security Council. Before considering any expansion of its agenda, we should ensure that any decision emanating from the Council should reflect a consensus of the United Nations membership. It is for this reason that we have been calling for priority to be given to the democratization of the Security Council and other United Nations organs. The Council must enjoy the confidence of the entire United Nations membership, for only then will its actions carry credibility.

These are only preliminary comments. The report contains many ideas with far-reaching implications. We therefore need to address it with much greater study and attention. After further deliberation, I think it will be worthwhile to discuss the report in depth in the various disarmament forums and amongst interested parties and groupings. I would therefore support the proposal made by the representative of China, who called for the compilation, and distribution in a document, of the many valuable suggestions and ideas expressed here today.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): As the representative of the United Kingdom spoke earlier in the meeting on behalf of the European Community and its member States, I did not intend to speak. However, in view of the great substance of the speeches that have been made since then and the content of some of them I wish to make a few brief comments.

First, we are aware of the usefulness and soundness of this debate and of the extent to which it demonstrates the vitality of the First Committee and the extreme clairvoyance of its Chairman. I think the debate has also demonstrated the responsibility felt by Member States and their determination to respond appropriately to the changes which we are witnessing. From that point of view, we can only welcome the fact that the Secretary-General's report, his introduction of it here and the statement made earlier in the meeting by the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs have stimulated reflection on this matter by all of us. We are very grateful to Mr. Petrovsky for devoting such a large part of his very full agenda to our work.

I shall not dwell on the substance of the suggestions and ideas contained in the Secretary-General's report as it would be premature to do so; I want merely to say a word about our objective, as we see it, and about the ways and means of achieving it.

In our view, the objective is to ensure that this movement of reflection, restructuring and reform necessitated by the new elements in the international security situation proceeds in an orderly, transparent and realistic fashion.

Disarmament certainly is not what it used to be. It is not isolated from reality - abstract and without substance - as in the past. Disarmament has become a reality and must therefore, to an ever greater extent, take account of new parameters, new aspects, including the non-proliferation of weapons of

(Mr. Errera, France)

mass destruction, confidence-building measures, transparency and regional security. These are all part and parcel of our common intellectual heritage, and we cannot but welcome the fact that last year the General Assembly, in resolution 46/36 L, entrusted to, respectively, the Secretariat and the Conference on Disarmament various distinct but complementary tasks concerning transparency in the field of armaments.

The question is how the competent bodies now in existence can be intelligently organized to achieve that objective. It is obvious that various bodies competent in the field of disarmament have already given the matter some thought. The Disarmament Commission started to reform its methods of work two years ago, and last year we began to see the fruits of that reform.

The Secretary-General, in his report, has put forward a number of new ideas. The First Committee has begun to rationalize its work and I think we should welcome this. Once again I wish to thank Ambassador Elaraby for convening the meetings of the "Friends of the Chairman", for a friendly and useful exchage of ideas.

As everyone knows, the Conference on Disarmament, having successfully achieved a Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons, has embarked on a process of reflection on and reform of its agenda, membership and methods of work. As the Chairman of the Conference said a few days ago, there is no doubt that this is an important process. We believe that, when the time comes, decisions taken by the Conference will be brought to the attention of the Secretariat.

I am also mindful of the fact that, as has been said many times, the Security Council held a Summit Meeting on 31 January last and defined a number of totally new ideas in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

(Mr. Errera, France)

It seems to us that these various processes must be developed. The world has become more diversified, less centralized, and that is another reason for avoiding any concept that is too global or too abstract, as well as any risk of excessive centralization that would disregard this diversity. In other words, we must take care to ensure that this important and necessary reform movement succeeds. In an ideal world we would have time to achieve that end. But, as the Ambassador of Mexico said this morning, we are short of time and, therefore, cannot reasonably envisage a process such as the one that in the past led to special sessions of the General Assembly.

(Mr. Errera, France)

We have no time, unfortunately, to decide on a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We all know that this requires time and effort, and that during such time we would have to come to a number of quick decisions.

We should therefore like to underscore two points. First, we support the proposal of the representatives of Mexico and Pakistan that a brief special session of the First Committee be held, in February or March of next year, for the specific purpose of discussing these various problems and so that careful consideration might be given to all questions before any decision is taken, and so that the decisions and opinions of each one might be put forward and discussed as a basis for various changes. Secondly, and in conclusion, I think that it would be useful for the thought processes of those of us who are members of the Conference on Disarmament if the Secretary-General's report were to be communicated to the Conference on Disarmament as an official document, so that the Conference might be able to take account of its important content in its future decision-making process.

Mr. SERVAIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): I should like to say that I welcome the presence of the Under-Secretary-General, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, during the discussion of the Secretary-General's report on arms regulation and disarmament and that we are very grateful to the Chairman for having called this meeting.

While I am speaking in my personal capacity, I believe that it is my duty, as President of the Conference on Disarmament, to explain to the First Committee the concerns which are felt by a number of the members of the Conference on Disarmament regarding the rumours, opinions and views

(Mr. Servais, Belgium)

expressed confidentially on different occasions, during the exercise which is going on now in the various bodies of the Secretariat relating to disarmament in general and the relationship between the First Committee, the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission in particular.

As President of the Conference on Disarmament, I should like to reaffirm its original status and exclusive competence as a negotiating body. The Conference has paid special attention to the words "rationalization and reorganization" because of their implications and ramifications. It is well aware of the need to adapt our ambitions and working methods to the evolving international situation. We also paid great attention to the suggestions that the Chairman put forward last week during the informal meeting of the Friends of the Chairman.

The question of the relationship between the various competent bodies in the field of disarmament is of both political and technical importance. We must bear in mind that each of our institutions has its own specific powers and membership and its own decision-making machinery. Careful consideration will doubtless demonstrate that the development of proper machinery will ensure harmonious functioning. Let us make sure that the gears are well oiled before we try to shift them. While we must not remain prisoners to past patterns, at the same time it is essential that we maintain and keep in working order the instruments that have already proved their effectiveness. I believe that that is the thrust of the message in the Secretary-General's important report on the new dimensions of arms control and disarmament in this post-cold-war era.

Mr. FOUATHIA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): First, may I say how grateful my delegation is to the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for his report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold war-era", which was presented to us during Disarmament Week this year.

I take this opportunity to express my delegation's gratitude to the Chairman for having given us the opportunity to have an exchange of views, which I am sure will enable us to concentrate our thoughts and the debate on the disarmament task facing us as a result of the new climate born of the recent upheavals in the international community.

I also take this opportunity to welcome the presence among us of Mr. Petrovsky, Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs.

First, the Algerian delegation would like to welcome the efforts of the Secretary-General to direct the action of the United Nations towards concretization of the objectives inscribed in the Charter, and we should like to assure him of our full support.

My delegation would like today to make a few preliminary remarks about this report, it being understood that this document, which is very important, is still being studied by various competent bodies in my country.

As concerns form, we consider that this document is obviously an innovative approach to the question of disarmament, which takes into account some secondary aspects of the problem. This approach tends to be global to the extent that it tends to avoid compartmentalising questions which are obviously linked, as was the case up till now. Finally, this approach has the merit of objectivity in the evaluation of the complex data relating to disarmament.

(Mr. Fouathia, Algeria)

However, we feel that, in view of the importance of the field of disarmament, we should certainly have preferred to see this document published simultaneously with the report entitled "An Agenda for Peace", failing its incorporation pure and simple into this report so as better to reflect the correlation between the questions of disarmament and the requirements of preventive diplomacy. Furthermore, this initiative of the Secretary-General was made public at a certain stage of the First Committee's work during the present session, which does not seem to us to have taken into account all the practical considerations, such as the time required for a wider exchange of views between the various interested delegations. Finally, we would have wished for more time in which to give very careful thought to such important aspects as those having to do with disarmament and security.

Another observation on form that we should like to make today has to do with the role of each of the competent bodies in the field of disarmament. Thus, we note that the report advocates some measures which run counter to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum having an agenda and a specific negotiating mandate. It is up to the General Assembly to recommend to the Conference a specific task, as can be seen in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28/Rev.1, which was introduced yesterday by Ambassador Servais of Belgium.*

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Fouathia, Algeria)

As to the substance, this report seems to contain a number of ideas with which we agree in so far as they offer a promise of success in the field of disarmament itself. Thus, we note with interest the recommendation that disarmament should be integrated into the agenda for peace and international security which the Secretary-General made at the same time as he stressed the relationship between the problems in this field and questions of a political and economic order, which we will have to take into account from now on.

We also share his concern about the threat from weapons of mass destruction, the risk of weapons proliferation and increased military expenditures, which are sometimes attributable to legitimate security needs that have not been met in some parts of the world. On the other hand, the solutions being advocated need further clarification.

We also think that it would be an illusion to try to base a just and lasting peace on as shaky a foundation, as problematic a notion as the imposition of peace. For our part, we consider that for peace to be lasting, it should rather be the result of a freely negotiated process, and this holds true for disarmament measures too.

Concerning the globalization of disarmament, we are also convinced that the United Nations may be called upon to play a particular role in promoting, at the regional level, conditions favouring specific disarmament measures, given that such measures cannot be viewed in isolation from the world context and even less so in isolation from the destructive capacity of the weapons in question. As each region has its own special features, these must be taken into account in any assessment, particularly if the purpose is to highlight the adverse effects caused much more by stockpiling weapons of mass destruction than by accumulating conventional weapons.

(Mr. Fouathia, Algeria)

Speaking of revitalizing the task of disarmament, we are rather inclined to think that, even if some multilateral legal instruments in this field have allowed a degree of stability to be achieved, others, unfortunately, seem to have sanctioned some de facto imbalances in the obligations of the parties and in addition even seem to ignore some undertakings that were freely entered into at the outset.

Concerning weapons of mass destruction, we should note that the bilateral negotiating process, even if it has enabled some cuts to be made in the main arsenals, has unfortunately not yet involved other nuclear Powers. Further, these initiatives should, in our view, be strengthened by prohibiting all nuclear tests as an additional measure to block the development of new weapons systems. Even though moratoriums are measures likely to open, gradually, the way towards a total nuclear-test ban, they cannot, in our view, be a substitute for concluding a binding legal instrument in this area, a legal instrument which must, first and foremost, be verifiable.

As to the Conventions on chemical and on biological weapons, they seem to us to be elements that are supplementary rather than necessary to the efforts to solve the problem of all weapons of mass destruction, including the nuclear weapons which must have pride of place in the negotiations.

The struggle to prevent weapons proliferation cannot be seen as a priority objective unless we intend to wage it rigorously and with no exceptions, as the report so rightly stresses. In terms of nuclear non-proliferation, we are obliged to remark - to our regret - that none of the fundamental elements of the problem has been mentioned. This is why we want there to be further consideration of this matter, to enable us to take into account all the aspects of the problem.

(Mr. Fouathia, Algeria)

We think that it will be difficult, in respect of arms transfers, to establish, without prejudicing the legitimate security of States, objective indices to make it possible to measure a level above which transfers become excessive, and even more difficult to establish what body would be entitled to make that determination.

As to transparency in the field of armaments, the same criticisms I mentioned in respect of arms transfers apply, with the additional difficulty that efforts aimed at non-proliferation may be thwarted. This, unfortunately, could lead to measures being adopted that reek of injustice, not to mention all that that would entail as infringements on the sovereignty of States.

The operation of the planned arms transfer Register cannot be effectively guaranteed without universal, honest and effective participation which would encompass all arms-related aspects and all categories of weapons. Only in this way will real openness and transparency achieve their true goal, that of building confidence, at regional level to begin with and taking into account the features peculiar to each region, and then at the world level.

In speaking about the individual role of the various United Nations bodies in a field as complex as that of disarmament, I must reaffirm Algeria's commitment to respect for the prerogatives of each of the bodies; this role must be reflected, in our opinion, in a careful balance which would nevertheless take into account the important role of the General Assembly.

Turning to realities and priorities, I hardly think it necessary to recall that our assessment is also shared by the overwhelming majority of States: we continue to believe that the realities of international life have not fundamentally changed and that the priorities in negotiations in the field

(Mr. Fouathia, Algeria)

of disarmament are the same as those established in 1978 during the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

In conclusion, I should like to tell you, Mr Chairman, that my delegation is of the opinion that an open-ended group of interested States should be set up around the office of Chairman of the First Committee with the main task of seeing what should be done to follow up this important document, which requires our thorough consideration and rather frequent exchanges of views to enable us to develop new ideas in this area using all the means at our disposal.

The CHAIRMAN: We have now heard the last speaker inscribed on the list of speakers for this special meeting of the First Committee devoted to the consideration of the Secretary-General's report (A/C.1/47/7).

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.